

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my debt of gratitude to Dr. Naphtali Wieder, whose teaching first inspired me to undertake research in the vast and formidable field of talmudic-midrashic literature, and who has remained my constant source of guidance and inspiration. Similarly, I wish to express my sincerest thanks to Professor Siegfried Stein for his encouragement and good will, particularly in the early difficult years, and for his many valuable suggestions.

"THE BOOK OF JOB IN RABBINIC THOUGHT"

BY

IRVING JACOBS, B.A.

UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE LONDON
LIBRARY

ABSTRACT

In the opening chapter of this dissertation, some solutions are offered for the problems arising from the confused and contradictory traditions relating to Job in talmudic-midrashic literature.

In successive chapters, the aggadic exegesis of the Book of Job is analysed and evaluated in detail, in order to demonstrate that it was profoundly influenced by traditional views relating to the book's authorship and historical setting.

The early tradition that Moses himself was the author of the Book of Job suggested that it shared a special relationship with the Pentateuch, which is presupposed by the Rabbis' consistent use of material from well-defined sections of the book in their expositions and homilies on many aspects of the creation of the world, the corruption of the Generation of the Flood and their ultimate annihilation, and the mythical monsters, to which only a passing allusion is made in the Genesis account of the creation.

The aggadic interpretation of the book was influenced further by a tradition of high antiquity, that Job was actually a contemporary of the bondage

and the exodus. Consequently, numerous utterances by Job and his companions were treated as allusions to events and personalities involved in Israel's early history as a nation.

In the final chapter, the aggadic content of the Targum to Job is re-examined in order to show its conformity with the rabbinic interpretation of the book, and the antiquity of certain traditions preserved in the extant text of the Targum, which may shed some light on the question of the relationship between the existing Targum and the ancient text current in the First Century CE.

CONTENTS

<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	p. 7.
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	p. 19.
<u>CHAPTER ONE: THE PERSONALITY OF JOB</u>	p. 40.
I. The Nature of the Problem.	
II. Job in Pre-Rabbinic Aggadah.	
III. Job in Early Rabbinic Ideology.	
IV. Job in Amoraic Sources.	
Additional Note I: Convert-Missionary Types.	
Additional Note II: The Attitude of R. Akiba towards Job.	
<u>CHAPTER TWO: ISRAEL AT THE EXODUS AND IN THE WILDERNESS</u>	p. 115.
I. Introductory Comments.	
II. The Speeches of Job.	
III. The Speeches of Eliphaz.	
IV. The Speeches of Elihu.	
V. The Speeches of Zophar.	
<u>CHAPTER THREE: THE WORK OF CREATION</u>	p. 188.
I. Introductory Comments.	
II. The Primordial Light.	

III. The Primordial Waters.

IV. The Creation of the World.

V. The Heavens and the Firmament.

VI. The Creation and the Fall of Man.

Additional Note I: In Defence of Creation and the
Creator.

Additional Note II: Rabbinic Embryology.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE MYTHICAL MONSTERS: BEHEMOTH,

LEVIATHAN AND ZIZ p. 274.

I. General Observations.

II. The Physical Features of the Behemoth and
Leviathan.

III. The Conflict with the Leviathan.

IV. The Messianic Role of the Leviathan.

V. The Monster Bird, Ziz.

VI. Rabbinic Traditions and Ancient Mythology.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE GENERATION OF THE FLOOD p. 320.

I. Introductory Comments.

II. The Revolt against God.

III. The Rejection of the Law.

IV. A Generation of Licentiousness.

V. The Antediluvians' Destruction by Fire.

CHAPTER SIX: THE TARGUM TO JOB p. 378.

I. General Observations.

II. The Creation of the World and the Generation of
the Flood.

III. The Expression גִּיחַ as "Rain" in the Targum.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

I. Rabbinic Literature

Abhoth de-Rabbi Nathan: ed. S. Schechter, London 1886.

Aggadath Bereshith: ed. S. Buber, Cracow 1903.

Aggadath Shir ha-Shirim: ed. S. Schechter, Cambridge
1896.

Alphabet of Ben Sira (1 and 2): ed. M. Steinschneider,
Berlin 1858.

Babylonian Talmud: Cited according to standard editions.

Battei Midrashoth: second edition, enlarged and emended
by A.J. Wertheimer (2 vols.), Jerusalem 1950.

Bereshith Rabbati: ed. Ch. Albeck, Jerusalem 1940.

Beth ha-Midrash: ed. A. Jellinek (Vols. I-VI), Leipsig
1853-1877.

Mayan Gannim: ed. S. Buber, Berlin 1889.

Mechilta de-Rabbi Ishmael: ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna
1870.

Mechilta de-Rabbi Shimon b. Yoḥai: ed. J.N. Epstein,
Jerusalem 1955.

Midrash ha-Gadol: Genesis, ed. M. Margulies, Jerusalem
1947.

Midrash Lekah Tobh: Genesis and Exodus, ed. S. Buber,
Vilna 1884. Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy,
ed. Padua, Vilna 1884.

Midrash Psalms: ed. S. Buber, Vilna 1891.

Midrash Rabbah: ed. Vilna, 1887. Genesis Rabbah, ed. E.

Theodor and Ch. Albeck, Berlin 1912-1932. Leviticus

Rabbah, ed. M. Margulies, Jerusalem 1953 et seq..

Midrash Shir Hashirim: ed. L. Gr^un^hu^t, Jerusalem 1897.

Midrash Tanhuma: ed. S. Buber, Vilna 1883.

Midrash Tanhuma: Old Version.

Midrash Tannaim: ed. D. Hoffmann, Berlin 1908-1909.

Ozar Midrashim: ed. J.D. Eisenstein, Vols. I-II, repr.

New York 1956.

Palestinian Talmud: ed. Krotoschin, repr. Jerusalem

1960.

Pesiḳta de-Rabh Kahana: ed. S. Buber, Lyck 1868.

-----: ed. B. Mandelbaum (2 vols.), New

York 1962.

Pesiḳta Rabbati: ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna 1880.

Pirḳei Rabbi Eliezer: ed. Warsaw 1852.

Trans. G. Friedlander, London 1916.

Seder Eliahu Rabbah (including Seder Eliahu Zuta): ed.

M. Friedmann, Jerusalem 1960.

Seder Olam Rabbah: ed. B. Ratner, Vilna 1894.

Sefer ha-Liḳḳuṭim: ed. L. Grunhut (Vols. I-VI),

Jerusalem 1898-1902.

Sefer ha-Yashar: ed. Venice 1624.

Siddur R. Sa'adja Gaon: ed. I Davidson, S. Assaf, B.I.

Joel, Jerusalem 1941.

Sifra: ed. J.H. Weiss, Vienna 1861.

Sifre: ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna 1864.

-----: Numbers and Sifre Zutta, H.S. Horovitz, repr.
Jerusalem 1966. Deuternomy, ed. H.S. Horovitz -
L. Finkelstein, Berlin 1939.

Tosephta: ed. M.S. Zuckerman, Jerusalem 1937.

Yalkut Makiri: ed. S. Buber, Berdyczew 1899.

Yalkut Shimoni: repr. New York 1944.

II. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Philo and Josephus

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament:
ed. R.H. Charles, Oxford 1913.

The Apocalypse of Abraham: trans. G.H. Box, London 1919.

The Testament of Abraham: trans. G.H. Box, London 1927.

The Testament of Job: ed. M.R. James, "Apocrypha
Anecdota", Cambridge 1897, pp. 104-137.

-----: ed. and trans. K. Kohler, "Semitic
Studies in Memory of Alexander Kohut", Berlin 1897,
pp. 264-353.

-----: ed. S.P. Brock, Leiden 1967.

Philo: trans F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, the Loeb
Classical Library, London/Cambridge (Mass.)
1956-1957.

III. Christian Sources

Clement of Alexandria: "Miscellenies", trans. O Stählin,

Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Zweite Reihe, Vols. 17,
19 and 20, Munich 1936-1938.

Cyprian: "On Mortality", Migne IV.

Eusebius: "Praeparatio Evangelica", ed Gifford, Oxford
1903.

Jerome: "Against John of Jerusalem", Migne XXIII.

-----: "Commentary on Job", Migne XXIII.

-----: Epistola, Migne XXII.

Methodius: "Catena on Job"

Tertullian: "Of Patience", Migne I.

-----: "Against Marcion", trans. Holmes, Ante-
Nicene Library VII.

B. MODERN LITERATURE

ALLON, G.: "מחקרים בתולדות ישראל" (2 Vols.),
הוצאת הקיבוץ המאוחד, 1957.

-----: "תולדות היהודים בארץ ישראל בתקופת המשנה",
1958. הוצאת הקיבוץ המאוחד, 3rd edition, והתלמוד

ALTMANN, A.: "Gnostic Themes in Rabbinic Cosmology",
"Essays Presented to J.H. Hertz", London 1942,
pp. 19-32.

-----: "The Rabbinic Adam Legends", JQR XXXV
(1944-1945), p. 371ff.

AMIR, J.: "Philo's Homilies on Love and Fear and their
Relationship to Palestinian Midrashim", Zion XXX
(1965), pp. 47-60.

- APTOWITZER, V.: "Kein und Abel in der Aggadah", Vienna 1922.
- BACHER, W.: "Die Agada der Tannaiten", 1st ed., Strassburg 1884.
- : "Die Agada der palästinischen Amoräer", Strassburg 1892 et seq..
- : "Das Targum zu Hiob", MGWJ III (1871), pp. 208-223.
- : "Das Targum zu den Psalmen", MGWJ IV (1872), pp. 408-416, and 463-473.
- BAER, I.: "ישראל בעמים", Jerusalem 1955.
- BARON, S.W.: "A Social and Religious History of the Jews", 2nd edition, Vols. I-II), Philadelphia 1952.
- BOUSSET, W.: "Hauptproblem der Gnosis", Göttingen 1907.
- BÜCHLER, A.: "The Political and Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris in the Second and Third Centuries", London 1909.
- : "Priester und Cultus im letzten Jahrzent des jerusalemischen Tempels", Vienna 1895.
- : "Studies in Sin and Atonement", London 1928.
- CASSUTO, U.: "פירוש על ספר שמות", 3rd ed., Jerusalem 1959.
- : "כנסת לזכר ח.נ. שירת העלילה בישראל", ביאליק "ספר ח' (חש'ג), עמ' 142-121.
- CHURGIN, P.: "תרגום כתובים", New York 1945.
- COHON, S.S.: "Original Sin", HUCA XXI (1948), pp. 275-330.

- CROSS, F.L.: "The Jung Codex and its Significance",
London 1955.
- DERENBOURG, J.: "Oevres Completes de R. Saadia ben Iosef
Al-Fayyumi, I "Version Arabe du Pentateuque,
Paris 1893.
- DRIVER, G.R.: "The Judaeen Scrolls", Oxford 1965.
- EPSTEIN, J.N.: "מבואות לספרות התנאים", Jerusalem 1958.
- EPSTEIN, L.M.: "Marriage Laws in the Bible and the
Talmud", Mass. 1942.
- EPSTEIN, J.N.: "פרוש הגאונים על סדר טהרות מיוחס לרב
האי גאון", Berlin 1924.
- FEUCHTWANG, D.: "Das Wasseropfer u. die damit verbundenen
Zeremonien", MGWJ LIV (1910), pp. 535-551; LV, pp.
43-63.
- FINKELSTEIN, L.: "מבוא למסכתות אבות ואבות דרבי נתן",
New York 1950.
- FISCHEL, H.A.: "Martyr and Prophet", JQR (NS) XXXVII,
pp. 265- 280, and 363-386.
- FRANKL, Z.: "Die Zusätze in der LXX zu Hiob", MGWJ
(1872), pp. 306-315.
- FREUDENTHAL, J.: "Hellenistische Studien" (Parts 1 and 2),
Breslau 1874-1875.
- GASTER, M.: "The Chronicles of Jerahmeel", Oriental
Translation Fund (NS) IV, 1889, p. 19ff, and lxiii
et seq..
- GASTER, T.H.: "Thespis", revised edition (Harper
Torchbook) New York 1966.

- GINZBERG, L.: "The Legends of the Jews" (7 Vols.),
Philadelphia 1909-1955.
- : "Ginzei Schechter" ("Genizah Studies in
Memory of Dr. Solomon Schechter") I, Midrash and
Haggadah, New York 1928.
- : "שאלות ותשובות", ha-Goren VIII, pp. 35-51.
- : "The Testament of Abraham", Jewish
Encyclopedia (new ed., 1925) I, pp. 93-96.
- GORDON, C.H.: "Leviathan: Symbol of Evil", "Biblical
Motifs: Origins and Transformations", ed. A.
Altmann, Cambridge Mass., 1966, pp. 1-9.
- : "Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent
Discovery", "Biblical and other Studies", ed. A.
Altmann, Cambridge Mass., 1963, pp. 3-14.
- : "Ugaritic Textbook", Rome 1965.
- GRAETZ, H.: "Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten
bis auf die Gegenwart", 4th ed., Leipzig 1873-1905.
- GRANT, R.M.: "Gnostic Anthology", London 1961.
- GÜDEMANN, M.: "Mythenmischung in der Haggada, ein
Beitrag zur Jüdischen Sagenschichte, wie zur
Mythologie der Aegypter, Phöniker und Grieschen",
MGWJ XXV (1876), pp. 177-195.
- GUNKEL, H.: "Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit",
Göttingen 1895.
- HARNACK, A. von: "Die Mission und Ausbreitung des
Christentums", Leipzig 1902.

- HASTINGS, J. (Ed.): "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics", Edinburgh 1908-1926.
- HESCHEL, A.J.: "תורה מן השמים" ("Theology of Ancient Judaism") I, London/New York 1962.
- HOLDHEIM, S.: "מאמר האישות", Berlin 1961.
- JASTROW, M.: "A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature", London/New York 1903.
- JONAS, H.: "The Gnostic Religion ", Boston 1958.
- KOHLER, K.: "Jewish Theology Systematically and Historically Considered", New York 1928.
- : "Pre-Talmudic Aggadah", JQR (OS) VII, (1895) pp. 581-606.
- KRAUSS, S. "Die Jüdischen Apostel", JQR (OS) XVII, pp. 370-383.
- LAUTERBACH, J.Z.: "The Ancient Jewish Allegorists in the Talmud and Midrash", JQR (NS) I (1910-1911), pp. 291-333, and 503-531.
- LEVY, J.: "Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim", Leipzig 1876-1889.
- LEWIS, J.P.: "A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature", Leiden 1968.
- LIEBERMAN, S.: "Gree^k_λ in Jewish Palestine", New York 1942.

-----: "משנת שיר השירים", appendix to "Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition", by G. Scholem, New York 1960, pp. 118-126.

-----: "תוספתא בפשוטה", (Orders Mo'ed, Zera'im and Nashim), New York 1955-1967.

LOEWE, R.J.: "A Jewish Counterpart to the Acts of the Alexandrines", JJS XII (1961), pp. 105-122.

-----: "Apologetic Motifs in the Targum to the Song of Songs", "Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations", ed. A. Altmann, Cambridge Mass. 1966, pp. 159-196.

LÖW, I.: "Lexikalische Mizellen", "Festschrift zum Siebsigsten Geburtstag David Hoffmanns", Berlin 1914, pp. 119-138.

LÖWENSTAMM, S.E.: "The Tradition of the Exodus and its Development" (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1965.

LOWY, S.: "The Extent of Jewish Polygamy in Talmudic Times", JJS IX (1958), pp. 115-138.

LUDIN-JANSEN, H.: "Existait-il a l'epoque hellenistique des predicateurs itinerents juifs?", Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, XVIII, pp. 242-254.

MANN, J.: "The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue", Cincinnati 1940.

MARMORSTEIN, A.: "The Background to the Aggadah",

- HUCA VI (1929), pp. 141-204.
- MOORE, G.F.: "Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era", Cambridge Mass. 1927.
- MUSURILLO, H.A.: "The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs", Oxford 1954.
- : "Acta Alexandrinorum de mortibus Alexandriae nobilium", Lipsiae 1961.
- NEUSNER, J.: "The Life of Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai", London 1962.
- PFEIFFER, R.H.: "History of New Testament Times", London 1949.
- PLOEG, van der, J.: "Le Targum de Job de la Grotte 11 de Qumran, Premiere Communication", Mededlingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks, deel 25, no 9, p. 15.
- POPE, M.H.: "Job" (The Anchor Bible), New York 1965.
- PREUSS, J.: "Biblisch-talmudische Medizin", Berlin 1911.
- QUASTEN, J.: "Patrology", Westminster, Maryland 1953-1960.
- RABBINOVICZ, R.: "ספרים", repr. New York 1960.
- RAPAPORT, U.: "Jewish Religious Propaganda and Proselytism in the Period of the Second Commonwealth" (Hebrew; Doctoral Thesis), Jerusalem 1966.

SANDER, R.: "Furcht und Liebe im Palästinensischen Judentum", Stuttgart 1935.

SANDMEL, S.: "Philo's Place in Judaism", HUCA XXVI (1955), pp. 151-332.

SCHECHTER, S.: "Midrash Fragment", "Studies in Jewish Literature issued in Honour of Professor K. Kohler", Berlin 1913, pp. 260-265.

SCHOLEM, G.: "Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism" (3rd edition), New York 1954.

-----: "Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition", New York 1960.

SCHÜRER, E.: "Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi" (4th edition), 1901-1911 Leipzig.

STERN, M.: "Sympathy for Judaism in Roman Senatorial Circles in the Period of the Early Empire", Zion XXIX (1964), pp. 155-167.

TENNANT, F.R.: "The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin", Cambridge 1903.

TORREY, C.C.: "The Apocalyptic Literature", Yale 1945.

TUR-SINAI, H.: "The Book of Job: A New Commentary", Jerusalem 1957.

URBACH, E.E.: "Ascesis and Suffering in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature", "Yitzhak F. Baer Jubilee Volume", Jerusalem 1960, pp. 48-68.

WEISS, J,H,: "דור דור ודורשיו" (4th edition, 5 Vols.), Vilna 1904.

WEINSTEIN, N.I.: "Zur Genesis der Agada", Frankfurt-am-Main 1901.

WIEDER, N.: "The Judean Scrolls and Karaism", London 1962.

-----: "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses", JJS IV (1953), pp. 158-175.

WIERNIKOWSKI, I.: "Das Buch Hiob nach der Affassung der rabbinischen Literatur in den ersten fünf nachchristlichen Jahrhunderten", Breslau 1902.

WOLSON, R.: "The Gnostic Problem", London 1958.

ZULAY, M.: "הלל ושמאי אחים?", Melilah V (1955), pp. 63-81.

-----: "עיוני לשון בפיוטי ינאי", Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem, VI (1945), pp. 161-248.

INTRODUCTION

From an analysis of the abundant material preserved in our sources relating to the aggadic exegesis of the Book of Job, it is clear that certain themes were consistently associated with this book in rabbinic thought, principally, the Creation of the World, the Generation of the Flood, Israel at the Exodus and in the Wilderness.¹ However, this need not be limited exclusively to the Book of Job. The early Jewish exegetes, as is well-known, constantly endeavoured to demonstrate to their listeners the uniformity in ideals between the three major divisions of the Bible. The manifold homilies preserved in our sources bear adequate testimony to their efforts to relate verses from every book of the Hagiographa to the main themes of the weekly pentateuchal lection. Consequently at the outset of this study, it is necessary to establish the particular place occupied by the Book of Job in rabbinic thought. Does the exegesis of the Book of Job merely reflect a wider tendency in the aggadic interpretation of the Bible, or was the book allotted a special role in relationship to the Pentateuch? We see from

our sources that traditions reflecting a special association between certain topics and the Book of Job were already formulated in early times. R. Judah the Patriarch ascribed to Job the special task of revealing the history of the Generation of the Flood, for which only the briefest details are recorded in the Pentateuch.² A further statement in the name of the Amora R. Johanan b. Nappaha, extends this tradition to include also Job's three companions, Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar. According to R. Johanan, these three personalities are actually referred to in the expression אנשי שם (Gen. 6:4), "men of renown", who recorded in detail the deeds of the Antediluvians.³ The remaining character of the book, Elihu, an enigmatic personality in the Aggadah, is also the subject of certain traditions. He is credited with the knowledge of mysteries relating to the mythical monsters, Behemoth and Leviathan, to which only a fleeting reference is made in the Genesis account of the creation.⁴ Elihu's name is further associated with the "miracle" of rain-fall to which he alludes in his frequent use of the expression גשם .⁵

These traditions, however, are limited only to specific subjects, involving particular

sections of the Book of Job, as we shall show subsequently. More substantial evidence has been preserved in our sources to show that the Book of Job as a whole shared a unique relationship with the Pentateuch. According to a tannaitic source found in both the Palestinian and the Babylonian Talmudim, Moses himself committed to writing not only the Pentateuch, but also the Book of Job:⁶

משה כתב ספרו ופרשה בלעם ואיוֹב. We would suggest further that this tradition, found also in early Christian sources,⁷ may account for the phenomenon regarding the fragment of the Book of Job from the Qumran caves. Like certain fragments of the Pentateuch found at Qumran, the fragment of Job is written in the archaic Canaanite script. It is conceivable that the Dead Sea Covenanters were familiar with the above notion, and therefore, reserved for the Book of Job the same script as for the Pentateuch itself.⁸

X

It is difficult to determine precisely the basis for this tradition. It may have been inspired initially by the closing chapters of the book, where God Himself speaks, revealing details of His work at the creation of the world. Possibly these Divine utterances may have been regarded as

an excerpt of the revelation at Sinai, where details of the creation-drama were imparted to Israel.⁹

Although the notion that the Book of Job actually formed part of the revelation at Sinai is not expressly stated in existing sources, it may be presupposed in a piyyut for Shebhu'oth from the Genizah attributed to Qallir. The poet refers to the "six" volumes of the Written Law given by God to Moses, referring, presumably, to the Pentateuch plus the Book of Job:-¹⁰

וירד " על הר סיני / לגלות לעניו צפונות ליפני
ששה בכתב בהגא עיניו / וששה בהלכות שינוני.

However, in view of the more tangible evidence preserved in our sources, we would suggest that the tradition regarding the Mosaic authorship of the Book of Job reflects a more fundamental notion of high antiquity, that Job was actually a contemporary of those events surrounding Israel's emergence as a nation. Consequently, Moses, who recorded Israel's early experiences, including the incident of Balaam, also set in writing the details relating to Job and his friends, which took place in his own life-time. Of the numerous datings suggested for Job in our sources, the oldest and most fully developed tradition is that

which assigns Job to the pentateuchal period of Israel's history. Already in the second century BCE, Aristeeas refers to the tradition that Job is identical with Jobab, king of Edom, "the fifth from Abraham", which, as Frankl observed, would place Job in the same generation as Amram, Moses' father.¹¹ This tradition forms the basis of the Job-legend in the pre-Christian Testament of Job, a work of great importance as a background for rabbinic Aggadah, which may have its origin early in the second pre-Christian century.¹² Early tannaitic sources elaborate on this tradition still further. In the earliest chronological work of post-biblical times, Seder 'Olam, Job's life-span is presented as coincidental with the two hundred and ten years of Israel's sojourn in Egypt.¹³ According to the second generation Tanna R. Ishmael, Job actually occupied a position of importance in the royal house-hold of Pharaoh, a notion which gained wide currency in talmudic times.¹⁴ Amoraic sources develop this notion further, ascribing to Job an important role in the exodus itself. His suffering at the hands of Satan, according to R. Hanina b. Hama, was God's means of diverting the attention of the Accuser, while Israel secured their passage

across the Red Sea in safety.¹⁵

We would suggest that it is possible to discern in the above-mentioned sources, the two main factors which had the widest repercussions on the aggadic exegesis of the Book of Job, the Mosaic authorship of the book, and the closely-related notion that the exodus-period itself was actually the "Sitz im Leben" of the drama which the book unfolds. As we shall show in the following pages, in view of its Mosaic authorship, the Book of Job was clearly regarded as a special supplement to the Torah, and was employed extensively by the Rabbis to provide information for lacunae in the pentateuchal text, details relating to the creation of the world, and to the conduct and ultimate destruction of the Generation of the Flood. Moreover, as the drama of Job was enacted against the backcloth of events surrounding Israel's early experience as a nation, the speeches and dialogues of the principal characters of the book were naturally regarded as a special source for allusions to those events, elaborating upon incidents and personalities in the pentateuchal account. We will endeavour to show further that there was not only a purpose in the exegesis of

the book, but also a discernible pattern. Certain subjects were associated with specific chapters or sections of the book. Both Tannaim and Amoraim drew consistently from the same selection of chapters or verses in connection with a given theme. Very frequently the early preacher has quoted his proof-text without indicating to his audience the appropriateness of the verse to his subject. This strongly suggests that the association between specific sections of the Book of Job and certain themes was well-known and widely acknowledged already in early times. Clearly the aggadic interpretation of certain sections of the book required little clarification. The large store of mythological material for which the book is noted, naturally commended itself to the Rabbis, and figures prominently in their discourses and discussions on cosmogonic and mythological themes and topics. In two of the chapters which follow, "The Work of Creation", and "The Mythical Monsters: Behemoth, Leviathan and Ziz", we will deal in detail with the numerous theories and notions which were associated by both Tannaim and Amoraim, with verses from this rich store of biblical traditions. It will also be necessary to give some

consideration to an important question which emerges from an analysis of the material, the age of certain rabbinic traditions and their relationship to the biblical legends with which they have been associated. It is clear that among the numerous myths and traditions which the Rabbis inherited, there are mythological elements of high antiquity, which have their origins ultimately in the very sources presupposed by the biblical text itself. Modern research has shown that biblical myths are, in a number of cases, only part of a broader heritage of the ancient near-east.¹⁶ On admission into the biblical text, these traditions were adapted and purged of their grosser polytheistic elements, in keeping with the dominant monotheism of the Old Testament. However, to what extent did the early Jewish scholars reverse this process through their allegorical interpretation of biblical myths? Clearly, the rabbinic traditions themselves are much-adapted. The sea-deity, Rahab, appears only as the see 12. 19 Protuberance
Powers above & B
Another Prince X "the Prince of the Sea".¹⁷ The lesser gods who do battle Quint
honor
Prince
Great Rep
of T. H. J.
Vat. a with the Leviathan, are merely angels in rabbinic P. t. c legend.¹⁸ Nonetheless, it is possible to discern within the rabbinic adaptation of the biblical

traditions, a recognisable reconstruction of the older, pre-biblical myth.

As a supplement to our main study on "The Work of Creation", we have included a note on the specialised use made of the Book of Job in connection with the subject of rabbinic embryology. From the abundant material preserved in our sources, both tannaitic and amoraic, it is clear that the Book of Job occupied a place of great prominence in the embryological studies of the Rabbis. A considerable number of notions, quasi-medical, theological, legendary, and perhaps semi-mystical, have been associated almost exclusively in talmudic-midrashic literature with verses from the Book of Job. In some measure this fact is self-explanatory, as certain passages contained in the Book of Job reflect notions relating to the formation and birth of a child which were probably current already in biblical times, principally Job 10:10-12:

הלא כחלב התיכני וכגבינה תקפיאני? עור ובשר תלבישני
ובעצמות וגידים תשככני. חיים וחסד עשית עמדי ופקודתך שמרה
רוחי. As can be seen from the material cited below, such verses were employed by the Rabbis as a basis, or receptacle for their own notions and theories regarding the formation of the embryo. There are,

however, a number of verses which figure prominently in our sources on this subject, which have been taken from contexts bearing no relationship to conception and child-birth. We shall endeavour^a to show subsequently that the selection and amplification of these verses reveal certain fundamental aspects of rabbinic thought relating to the miraculous nature of יצירת הולד.

Turning to the remaining major theme with which we shall deal in the following pages, we may observe that the association between the Book of Job and the Generation of the Flood is a significant one. The tradition in the name of R. Judah the Patriarch cited earlier, is adequately supported by numerous expositions in both tannaitic and amoraic sources, of verses drawn particularly from Job's speeches in chapters 21 and 24. Moreover, we shall show that a number of the traditions and notions which the Rabbis have associated with proof-texts from Job, reflect some of the earliest developments of the flood-legend which we find in older non-rabbinic sources. However, it is of particular significance for our study to note that the special role allotted to the Generation of the Flood in rabbinic thought is largely reflected in the aggadic exposition of

verses and passages from the Book of Job. As can be seen already in earliest apocryphal sources, the elaboration of the terse biblical account of the Antediluvians followed a definite tendency which reached its fullest developed form in rabbinic sources. The tendency in the Aggadah to idealise biblical personalities, transforming them into prototypes for saintly qualities, is well-known. Undoubtedly, the classical example for this aggadic tendency is the personality of Abraham,¹⁹ although we shall show subsequently, that in early times the personality of Job was likewise transformed into a prototype for certain virtues. With the Generation of the Flood, however, we see this tendency working with the opposite effect. The Antediluvians were clearly regarded and employed as archetypes for evil, the prototypes for all the vices and iniquities abhorrent to the Rabbis. Numerous verses from the Book of Job were introduced into graphic descriptions of the crimes of the Generation of the Flood, their revolt against God, their violence, their gross immorality, and the devastating punishment which they incurred. In a number of cases it will be possible to show that these crimes of the Antediluvians were not

simply the product of the rabbinic imagination, but may reflect actual social and religious evils which the Rabbis witnessed about them.

In conclusion, it will be necessary to give some consideration to the relationship between the Targum to Job and the exegesis of the book in rabbinic Aggadah. Although the Targum to Job has been the subject of two detailed studies,²⁰ so far no scholar has examined this Targum in the light of a full and detailed analysis of the aggadic exegesis of the Book of Job. We shall endeavour^a to show that the aggadic material contained in the Targum, which, as Bacher suggests, may only be a remnant of its former contents, does conform with the underlying principles mentioned above, which have exerted the greatest influence on the allegorical interpretation of the Book of Job generally, its Mosaic authorship, and the notion that the exodus-period is the "Sitz im Leben" of the book. However, two major themes are conspicuous by their almost total absence in the Targum, the Creation of the World, and the Generation of the Flood. We will endeavour to offer some solution for the problems arising from these two omissions. Moreover, as a result of our wider studies of the

Book of Job in the Aggadah, we will be able to show that the Targum has preserved a number of very old elements, in some cases echoing traditions found only in early non-rabbinic sources. It is possible, therefore, that we may be able to shed a little light on the relationship between the existing Targum to Job and the mysterious text concealed on the Temple-mount by Gamliel the Elder, about which there has been so much speculation.

However, before proceeding to a detailed examination of the abundant material at our disposal, it is necessary to give some consideration to what may be the most puzzling problem which emerges from the treatment of the Book of Job in rabbinic Aggadah, the fate of Job himself. There appears to be no consistency in the rabbinic attitude towards any aspect of the personality of Job. He is placed in every conceivable period of biblical history, one scholar actually denying his very existence. In one generation of teachers he is elevated to the supreme status of an *אברהם מלך* , while later in the talmudic period he is denigrated as a blasphemer! On the one hand, Job is equated with Abraham, while on the other hand, his qualities are shown to be totally inferior

to those of the patriarch. Our first task, therefore, must be an attempt to bring some order to this maze of conflicting opinions and traditions. We will begin by assessing the earliest traditions relating to Job preserved in our sources. In pre-Christian times a clearly defined picture of Job existed, elements of which survived among the Rabbis. We will endeavour to trace the development and modification of this early picture of Job during the talmudic period, against the wider background of ideological and religious developments.

Notes

1. The existence of these dominant themes was not appreciated by Isaak Wiernikowski in his analysis of the aggadic exegesis of the Book of Job (cf "Das Buch Hiob nach der Auffassung der rabbinischen Literatur in den ersten fünf nachchristlichen Jahrhunderten", Breslau 1902). This scholar based his analysis on a series of general headings which appear to be pre-selected rather than derived from the material itself ("Exegesis", "Biblical Narratives", "The Study of the Law", "Religious Philosophy"). Consequently, Wiernikowski did not do justice to the abundant material at his disposal. Moreover, his classification of the sources into tannaitic and amoraic statements, while of some value for assessing the antiquity of certain traditions and exegetical trends, seriously inhibited a more extensive study of the developments within the aggadic interpretation of the book.

2. Cf GR 26:7 (ed. T-A, p. 255): רבי אומר: אילו לא בא איוב לעולם אלא לפרש לנו מעשה דור המבול, דיו (The reading לפרש , or לפרוש , is supported by MSS Oxford, Stuttgart and Munich. MSS London, Paris and Vatican read לפרט , or לפרוט. See also Tanh. B. I,

p. 54: אתה מוצא מעשה דור המבול נתפרשו, ומעשה דור
הפלגה לא נתפרשו, מעשה דור המבול פרשו איוב.....

3. Cf GR loc. cit.: א"ר יוחנן: "המה הגבורים אשר
מעולם אנשי השם (בר' ו, 4), ומי פירש מעשיהם? אנשי
השם", אליפז התימני ובלדד השוחי וצופר הנעמתי.

This reading is supported by almost all MSS of Genesis Rabbah, and is undoubtedly the correct one. However, MSS London, Paris, Vatican and also Stuttgart read פורש for פירש. That R. Johanan's statement represents merely a development of the older tradition formulated by Judah the Patriarch, is by no means certain. From the material quoted below, we see that R. Meir applied verses from the speeches of Eliphaz to the subject of the flood without indicating the appropriateness of his proof-texts to his subject matter (see pp. 327 and 330) which suggests that some association between מעשה דור המבול and sections of Job other than the speeches of its hero, was acknowledged already in tannaitic times. It is possible, therefore, that R. Johanan's view reflects an independent and more comprehensive tradition regarding the exegesis of the Book of Job with reference to the flood, which was current in the talmudic period.

4. Cf Gen. 1:21, which was widely accepted as an

allusion to the mythical beasts, cf Targum Ps. Jonathan ad loc.; also GR 7:4 (ed. T-A, p. 52). On Elihu's special role in connection with these beasts, see below, p. 274ff.

5. Cf GR 26:7 (ed. T-A, p. 255): אמר ר' חנין: אילו לא בא אליהו אלא לפרש לנו מעשה ירידת גשמים, דיו, דא'ר יוחנן: כל אורה שנאמר באליהו אינה אלא בירידת גשמים.

On the interpretation of אור as מטר, for which the Targum to Job is notably our primary source, see below, p. 391ff. Although the two statements in the above passage are clearly related, they may not refer to the same store of aggadic traditions. It is conceivable that מעשה ירידת גשמים, the "mystery" or "miracle" of rain-fall, which, in rabbinic traditions, was equated with the entire work of creation (see below, p. 392, and note 49 ad loc.) was a branch of early mystical lore like מעשה מרכבה and מעשה בראשית which was associated with the enigmatic personality of Elihu who was credited with other secret knowledge (see below, p. 275).

6. Cf BB15a; PT Sot. v, 20d.

7. Cf Ginzberg, "The Legends of the Jews", p. 382, note 3.

8. Cf, however, Driver, "The Judaeen Scrolls", p. 414, where he suggests that this script may have been used for Job as it was regarded as proper to the patriarchal period, which is the historical setting suggested by the book. ✕

9. Cf Cant. R. to 1:4, הביאני המלך חדריו, which has been taken midrashically as "The King (at Sinai) admitted me to His secrets" (see below, p. 275):

ר' ברכי' אמר: כתיב "ויגד לכם את בריתו (דבר' ד' 13)",
ויגד לכם את ספר בראשית שהוא תחילת בריתו של עולם.....

See also R. Yannai's statement ad loc..

10. Cf M. Zulay, "הלל ושמאי אחים?", Melilah V, (1955) p. 70; also N. Wieder, "The Judean Scrolls and Karaism", p. 232, note 1. It is possible that Qallir has merely elaborated upon the early notion of the Mosaic authorship of Job. However, as is often the case, his comment may be based on aggadic material no longer extant.

11. Cf Eusebius, "Praeparatio Evangelica" ix, 25, ed. Gifford I, p. 540f (see also Freudenthal, "Hellenistische Studien", p. 136ff); also Frankl, MGWJ 1872, p. 313. This tradition probably gained wide currency outside Palestine as it was incorporated into the Colophon to the LXX on Job.

12. A full appreciation of this source, as well as those cited in the preceding note, is given below, p. 42ff.

13. Cf chapter 3, (ed. Ratner, p. 13-14); also Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yoḥai, p. 34; PT Soṭah v, 20c; GR 57:4 (ed. T-A, p. 615); also BB 15a:

נשת"ירו (ישראל) שם ר' י שנים סימן שנותיו של איוב, שבאותו פרק נולד שנאמר "ויחי איוב אחרי זאת מאה וארבעים שנה (מ'ב 16)", ואמר "ויוסף ה' את כל אשר לאיוב למשנה (שם 10)", נמצאת אומר כשירדו ישראל למצרים נולד איוב, וכשעלו מת.

Seder 'Olam is particularly important in this context as it accounts for the figure 210 in connection with Job 42:10, 'ויסף ה' את כל אשר לאיוב למש', which was understood as referring not only to Job's possessions, but also to the number of years he had attained at the time of his trial. Hence, Job was seventy when his suffering came upon him, and was blessed with a further one hundred and forty years of life. This kind of computation may be very early, as it occurs already in the Testament of Job, although this source bases its computation upon the total of Job's remaining years recorded in the LXX to 42:16. Thus Job's age at the time of his suffering is given as eighty-five, and his remaining years as one hundred and seventy (the LXX itself, however, agrees with Seder 'Olam in affixing Job's age at

his trial as seventy). It is this significant detail that marks the difference between older sources and the amoraic tradition which transfers Job's trial from a point early in the bondage to the setting of the exodus itself (see next note).

14. Cf PT Soṭah loc. cit.; also Targum Ps.

Jonathan to Ex. 9:20: אִיּוֹב מַעֲבָדִי פֶּרַעַה הִיָּה וּמַגְדוּלִי פִּמְלִיאָ שְׁלוֹ, הַה' ד' הִירָא אֶת דְּבַר ה' , וּכְתִיב בִּיה „אִישׁ תָּם וַיֵּשֶׁר יִרְאֵה אֱלֹקִים וְסָר מֵרָע". See further, Soṭah 11a, the statement of R. Simai that Job, along with Jethro and Balaam, was a member of Pharaoh's council at the time of the oppression.

15. Cf Ex. R. 21:7: מִשַּׁל לְרוּעָה שֶׁהִיָּה מַעֲבִיר צֹאנוּ בְּנֶהֱרָ, בָּא זָאֵב לְהִתְגַּדֵּר בְּצֹאֵן, רוּעָה שֶׁהִיָּה בָקִי מָה עֹשֶׂה? נֹטֵל תִּישׁ גְּדוֹל וּמַסְרוֹ לוֹ, אָמַר: יְהִי מִתְגַּשֵּׁשׁ בֹּזֵה עַד שֶׁנֶּעֱבַר אֶת הַנֶּהֱרָ, וְאַחֵר כֵּךְ אֲנִי מִבִּיאוֹ. כֵּךְ בִּשְׁעָה שִׁיצְאוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם עִמּוֹ סִמְאֵל הַמִּלֶּאךָ לְקַטְרֵג אוֹתָן, אָמַר לִפְנֵי הַקֶּב"ה: רַב־שׁוֹעַ, עַד עָכְשָׁו הָיוּ אֵלּוּ עוֹבְדֵי עֹלָם, וְאַתָּה קוֹרֵעַ לָהֶם אֶת הַיָּם? מָה עֹשֶׂה הַקֶּב"ה? מִסֵּר לוֹ אִיּוֹב שֶׁהִיָּה מִיוֹעֲצֵי פֶּרַעַה – דְּכִתִּיב בּוֹ „אִישׁ תָּם וַיֵּשֶׁר יִרְאֵה אֱלֹקִים וְגו' ", וְאָמַר „הִירָא אֶת דְּבַר ה' מַעֲבָדִי פֶּרַעַה". א' ל: „הֵנוּ בִידֶךְ", אָמַר הַקֶּב"ה: עַד שֶׁהוּא מִתְעַסֵּק עִם אִיּוֹב יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹלָם לִי וַיּוֹרְדִים, וְאַחֲכָא צִיל אֶת אִיּוֹב, וְהוּא שֶׁאֵמַר אִיּוֹב „שְׁלוֹ הִיָּתִי וַיִּפְרַפְרֵנִי וְאַחֲזִי בְּעַרְפִּי וַיִּפְצַּצֵנִי (ט' ז, 12)", כְּדֵי לַעֲשׂוֹת אוֹתִי לַעֲמוֹ לְמַטְרָה, שֶׁנֶּ' וַיִּקְיַמֵנִי לוֹ לְמַטְרָה (שם)", וּכְתִיב „יִסְגִּירֵנִי קֵל אֶל עוֹיִל" (שם 11), מִסְרֵנִי בִידֶךְ הַשֵּׁטֶן וְכְדֵי שֶׁלֹּא יִצְאוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל רִשְׁעִים בְּדִין לִכְךָ הִרְטָה אוֹתִי בִידּוֹ, הוּי „וְעַל יְדֵי רִשְׁעִים יִרְטֵנִי (שם)". בְּאוֹתָהּ שַׁעַת הַקֶּב"ה אָמַר לְמֹשֶׁה: הֲרִי מִסְרֵתִי אִיּוֹב לַשֵּׁטֶן, מָה בִידֶךְ לַעֲשׂוֹת? „דְּבַר אֶל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּסְעוּ (שְׁמוֹת

"(15 7' . We have emended the text in lines 8-9, on the basis of R. Ishmael's statement in the preceding note; printed editions do not contain Ex. 9:20.

16. Cf particularly T.H. Gaster's study relating to this subject, "Thespis" (revised edition, New York 1966) to which we will refer frequently below.

17. See below, p. 194.

18. See below, p. 288f.

19. For the relevant material in both rabbinic and non-rabbinic sources, cf S. Sandmel, "Philo's Place in Judaism", HUCA XXVI, 1955, pp. 151-216.

20. Cf Bacher, "Das Targum zu Hiob", MGWJ 1871, pp. 208-223; also P. Churgin, "Targum Ketuvim", New York 1945, pp. 67-116.

CHAPTER ONE: THE PERSONALITY OF JOB

I. The Nature of the Problem

The marked deterioration in the attitude of the Rabbis towards the personality of Job during the talmudic period presents a problem which has not been adequately defined or formulated. From a study of the relevant rabbinic sources in conjunction with older, pre-rabbinic writings, it is clear that the varying opinions expressed in talmudic-midrashic literature concerning Job, represent a gradual, but distinct departure from the earliest recorded traditions relating to him. The Testament of Job, which may have been compiled two centuries prior to the earliest datable allusion to Job in rabbinic sources, contains a fully developed and well-defined picture of its hero, unequalled by any descriptions of Job preserved in rabbinic literature. Job is portrayed as a saintly paragon of virtue of the Abrahamic type, long before Abraham himself emerges as such in rabbinic Aggadah.¹ Evidently, some knowledge of this early picture of Job survived into rabbinic times, and is reflected particularly in older tannaitic sources. However, already in tannaitic times, there is evidence of an attempt

to qualify the older image of Job, his virtues are acknowledged, but presented as inferior to those of the patriarch, Abraham. In amoraic times, this tendency was clearly intensified, the older notion of Job's piety and endurance was not simply qualified, but completely negated. In amoraic sources, the saintly and virtuous Job of biblical, and pre-rabbinic literature, emerges as a rebellious and unstable figure, in no way comparable with Abraham.

From this brief out-line of the sources, we may observe that the problem of Job in rabbinic traditions is essentially a two-fold one. Firstly, what occasioned the radical change in attitude towards Job, particularly among the later rabbinic teachers? Secondly, what significance is to be attached to the involvement of the personality of Abraham in the varying attitudes towards Job recorded in both rabbinic and non-rabbinic literature? Before proceeding to offer some solution for this problem, it is necessary to re-examine our earliest sources in order to define in more precise terms, the place occupied by Job in pre-rabbinic thought, as this may provide us with a useful background for our subsequent deliberations.

II. Job in Pre-Rabbinic Aggadah

Our primary source for the early legend of Job in its most complete form, is undoubtedly the Testament of Job.² Since the end of the last century, the Testament has attracted little attention.³ While modern scholarly opinion has tended to support Kohler's contention that the Testament is pre-Christian in origin, 75 BCE being the date suggested as the terminus ad quem for its compilation,⁴ no further observations have been made regarding the nature and character of this early work. Kohler has adequately demonstrated^t the value of the Testament as an early background for a number of traditions recorded in rabbinic sources. However, his classification of the Testament simply as a pre-rabbinic Midrash, has partially obscured its significance. From a fresh analysis of its contents in the light of more recent scholarship, it can be shown that the Testament was written in conformity with a basic literary scheme found in other early writings, and contains a number of the main literary features found in early Jewish and Christian martyria.⁵

Like the true martyr, Job, having witnessed the truth of God, is forewarned of his

trial by suffering should he challenge the power of Satan by destroying the Seducer's idol.⁶ His impending struggle with Satan is likened to a wrestling contest between an athlete and a powerful adversary.⁷ This choice of terminology is particularly significant, as in Jewish, Christian and pagan martyr-literature, "Athlete" is the epithet for the martyr.⁸ We may note further that in patristic literature, Job is actually called the Athlete of the Church before the advent of Christ.⁹

Despite the possibilities of great suffering, Job refuses to withdraw from the impending contest, declaring, "I shall from love of God endure until death all that will come upon me ...".¹⁰ Job's terrible afflictions, the equivalent of the martyr's tortures, and his remarkable powers of endurance, are greatly amplified in the Testament.¹¹ Far from diminishing his great suffering, Job sustains it with his own hand until God should decree otherwise.¹² Satan, who fills the role of Job's torturer, is obliged to admire his victim's invincible spirit, and concedes victory to his mortal opponent.¹³ Moreover, in keeping with the image of the martyr, Job, at the climax of his suffering, receives the power of prophetic vision.¹⁴

As to the publicity of Job's trial, we would suggest that this is achieved in the Testament by the transformation of Job's three friends into monarchs, who come to witness their comrade's suffering accompanied by their retinues of soldiers.¹⁵ After Job's restoration, these three friends are informed that he has gained salvation for them, while Elihu, the mortal representative of Satan,¹⁶ is condemned to death and eternal damnation.¹⁷ Job himself, the reader is assured, will gain the immortality promised him at the outset of his trial.¹⁸

The above analysis of the Testament is by no means exhaustive. One further, important aspect of the imagery employed in this early work, the portrayal of Job as a prototype missionary, is discussed in an additional note below,¹⁹ in conjunction with similar traditions relating to other biblical personalities. However, the basic elements outlined above, which form the framework of the Job-narrative in the Testament, are sufficient to indicate the nature and the purpose of this work as a whole. It is essentially an early example of Jewish martyr-literature, in which Job, the biblical example for patience amid suffering, is transformed into a prototype for

those who are exposed to danger on account of their faith, and may be obliged to endure unto death for love of God. We will now endeavour to show how this tradition survived into talmudic times, leaving its impress upon both Jewish and Christian traditions.

III. Job in Early Rabbinic Ideology

The problem of the varying attitudes towards Job in earliest rabbinic sources is possibly more complex than any other aspect of the portrayal of this personality in talmudic-midrashic literature. The paucity of the available material allows only for a fragmentary picture of Job in early rabbinic thought. Moreover, the terminology employed in these sources is obscure, particularly the expressions *אֱלֹהִים* and *אֱלֹהִים*, which figure so prominently in the comments of the early teachers relating to Job. Despite the literature devoted to an analysis and definition of these terms in early sources,²⁰ their precise implications in every context are by no means certain, as will be seen subsequently. Nonetheless, from a re-examination of all the available material, some fresh observations can be made regarding Job's place in

the conflicting ideologies of the earliest rabbinic scholars.

Our primary source for the conflicting attitudes towards Job among the earlier Tannaim, is Mishnah Soṭah 5:5. This Mishnah records a revision of a notion which, presumably, was the officially accepted one among the scholars at Yabneh at the close of the first century CE. We are informed that throughout his life, Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai, who had dominated the early years of the Yabneh School, ascribed Job's religious merits to the motive of **יראה**, as is clearly stated in Job 1:1. However, on the day of Rabban Gamliel's deposition from the office of patriarch, R. Joshua b. Hyrkanos asserted that Job's conduct had been motivated by **אהבה**:-

"On that same day, R. Joshua	בו ביום דרש ר'
b. Hyrkanos declared: Job	יהושע בן הורקנוס:
served God out of love! as it	לא עבד איוב אלא
is said, 'Though He slay me,	מאהבה, שנ' הן
yet will I trust in Him (Job	יקטלני לו איחל".
13:15)!'. However, this verse	ועד"ן הדבר שקול,
alone is inconclusive (on	לו אני מצפה, או
account of the k'thibh/k're ,	איני מצפה? תלמוד
לא). Did Job mean, 'I	לומר "עד אגוע לא

do place my hope in Him	אסיר תומתי ממני",
(viz. לו)? Or 'I do not	מלמד שמאהבה עשה.
place my hope in Him (viz.	אמר ר' יהושע: מי
לא)? Therefore, he says	יגלה עפר מעיניך,
elsewhere (27:5) 'Till I	רבן יוחנן בן זכאי,
die, I will not put away	שהיית דורש כל ימך
mine integrity from me! ²¹ ,	שלא עבד איוב את
which proves that he acted	המקום אלא מיראה,
out of love.	שנ' "איש תם וישר
"R. Joshua b. Hananiah said:	ירא אלקים וסר
Would that the dust might be	מרע", והלא יהושע
removed from your eyes, Rabban	תלמיד תלמידך,
Johanan b. Zaccai, for through-	למד שמאהבה
out your life, you maintained	עשה?
Job had served God only out	
of fear, as it is said, 'and	
that man was whole-hearted	
and upright, and one that	
feared God and shunned evil (ibid., 1:1)'. And	
now has not Joshua, your pupil's pupil, deduced	
that he acted from love?!".	

Although the contents of this Mishnah have been discussed by scholars for more than a century,²² the nature and purpose of R. Joshua's re-assessment of Job's religious motives have not been fully

understood. Büchler²³ alone noted that R. Joshua's statement presupposes an interpretation of love for God which occurs in the statements of other teachers of his period. As is well-known, R. Akiba interpreted the injunction in Deut. 6:5, 'ואהבת את ה' אפילו נוטל את נפשך, as אלקיך בכל נפשך, "even though He take away thy soul!"²⁴ Ben Azzai rendered this same verse as, עד מוצוי נפש, "until the squeezing out of the soul!"²⁵ Similarly, R. Meir, Akiba's pupil, who witnessed the excesses of the Hadrianic persecutions, saw the fulfilment of this command in the action of Isaac, "who bound himself upon the altar ready to be slain".²⁶

As Büchler observed further, this uncompromising interpretation which was placed upon the notion of love for God, was by no means an academic one, but "determined the self-sacrifice of many prominent martyrs and their followers during the Hadrianic persecutions".²⁷ We may elaborate further on Büchler's observations regarding the ideological developments which are an important feature of this turbulent period of Jewish history. The interpretation of love for God in terms of martyrdom represents only the culmination of the extremist views which^w_A were generated by the

intolerable conditions of that time. For the politically and religiously oppressed population of Palestine, this world became a place of deep gloom, to be rejected in favour of preparations for the bliss of the afterlife.²⁸ The suffering caused by continued persecutions, was not merely rationalised by the teachers of this period, but was transformed into a prerequisite for entry into the world to come.²⁹ Affliction became the purifying agent of the pious, cleansing them of their few transgressions, thus ensuring their place in the hereafter.³⁰ As such, afflictions were to be welcomed as a mark of Divine favour, bestowed by God in love, and therefore, to be received in a similar spirit of love and joy.³¹ Conditioned by such notions, the pious might even long for martyrdom as the ultimate consummation of their love for God. Thus Akiba himself rejoiced at his terrible death, which he regarded as the fulfilment of a command which he had waited so long to perform, to love God even at the cost of his life.³²

There is some evidence in our sources to suggest that these extremist tendencies which are characteristic of rabbinic thought during the Hadrianic persecutions, had their origins in an

earlier period of suffering following the destruction of the Second Temple, and did not disappear entirely during the intervening years separating these two catastrophic events.³³ In this context, R. Joshua b. Hyrkanos' statement on the day of Gamliel's deposition, with its implied definition of love for God, is of some additional significance, as it indicates the re-emergence of the martyr-ideal among the scholars at Yabneh three to four decades prior to the Hadrianic persecutions. Moreover, R. Joshua's statement is to be regarded as our earliest datable source for the martyr interpretation of love for God in rabbinic literature. However, we have yet to account for R. Joshua's association of the martyr-ideal specifically with the personality of Job. We can assume initially that this was part of a wider tendency. The exponents of the martyr-ideal, as in earlier ages, sought to support their beliefs by means of biblical examples, reviving old traditions, and even developing new prototypes for martyrdom.³⁴ As we have shown above, the tradition of Job as a martyr-figure was established already in pre-Christian times, and was evidently known to R. Joshua, whose words virtually echo

Job's own declaration in the Testament: "I shall from love of God endure unto death all that shall come upon me!"³⁵ We would suggest, therefore, that in declaring Job to have served God out of love, it was R. Joshua's intention to re-establish this personality as an example of the martyr-ideal for his contemporaries, among whom the spirit of martyrdom was re-awakening. That Job was actually accepted as such, particularly in the circle of Akiba, is indicated in several sources. Akiba himself cites Job in connection with Deut. 6:5, as an example for the grateful acceptance of any measure of treatment which God may mete out to a man.³⁶ Echoing R. Joshua b. Hyrkanos' view, R. Meir, Akiba's pupil, and his contemporary, R. Nathan, both declared Job to have served God out of love, R. Meir, contrary to the general tendency in rabbinic literature, actually equates Job with Abraham.³⁷ As both these scholars shared Akiba's interpretation of *אברהם* in terms of martyrdom,³⁸ we can assume that their evaluation of Job as an *עוֹלָם מֵאַהֲבָה*, like that of R. Joshua b. Hyrkanos, presupposes the tradition of Job as a prototype for the martyr ideal.

By way of contrast, it is interesting to

note the attitude towards Job of a teacher who was staunchly opposed to the extremist tendencies of Akiba and his associates, R. Ishmael.³⁹ Like Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai, R. Ishmael persisted in stressing the scriptural evaluation of Job's character as a מִקְדָּשׁ (Job 1:1) identifying him with the God-fearing servant of Pharaoh, mentioned in Exodus 9:20.⁴⁰ The dependence of Job's esteem in rabbinic circles upon the martyr-ideal, may be indicated further by the decline in attitude towards him at the close of the tannaitic period, when martyrdom had ceased to be a practical issue. Reverting, possibly, to the earlier view which had prevailed in rabbinic circles prior to Gamliel's deposition, Job is portrayed merely as a pious heathen, who, according to R. Hiyya, received his deserts and was dismissed from the world.⁴¹ R. Hiyya's contemporary, R. Simai, presumably with the intention of qualifying Job's image as a pious martyr suffering for his faith, implies that his afflictions were a Divine punishment for his lack of moral courage when, as a member of Pharaoh's council, he failed to oppose the wicked plan to exterminate the Israelite children.⁴² In the light of these sources, we can assume that Job's brief period of favour in rabbinic circles merely as an ideological expediency,

resulting from the unhappy conditions prevailing in second century Palestine, which permitted the revival of an ancient tradition. With the gradual disappearance of these conditions, the early picture of Job receded once more into obscurity.

This revival of the ancient tradition of Job as a pious martyr-figure in the tannaitic period constitutes less of a problem than the disappearance or modification of this tradition in rabbinic circles. Why was the early image of Job as a paragon of virtue of the highest type modified already in the first century CE. A century before the beginning of the Christian Era, the author of the Testament of Job portrays his hero in terms comparable with those employed in later rabbinic literature to describe the patriarch Abraham.⁴³ His religious fervour is explicitly ascribed in the Testament to his love for God. However, Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai insisted throughout the long years of his activity, that Job's conduct had been inspired by *יראת*, and not *אהבה*. This view was shared also by the author of the Baraita of the seven types of Pharisees, who presents Job as the scriptural prototype for the *פרוש יראת*, and, therefore, inferior to Abraham,

the prototype for the highest ideal, the פרוש אהבה.⁴⁴
This same attitude is reflected further in Abhoth
d'Rabbi Nathan, where the respective virtues of Job
and Abraham are contrasted.⁴⁵ Not only is Job's
hospitality minimised in this source, but, in
complete contradiction to the Testament of Job,
which clearly alludes to his efforts as a
philanthropic missionary,⁴⁶ Job is criticised for
his failure to employ his hospitality to win
converts to the true faith, as did Abraham! Although
no explicit allusion is contained in this source
to Abraham's superiority over Job as an עובד מאהבה,
it may be presupposed, as missionary activity was
regarded in tannaitic times as an expression of
love for God, as illustrated specifically by
Abraham.⁴⁷ It is interesting to note further that
Job's inferiority to Abraham "the friend of God
(= 'אֱוֹהֵב ה')",⁴⁸ is stressed also in an apocryphal
source, the Testament of Abraham, which may have
been written during Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai's
lifetime.⁴⁹ The author of this work asserts that none
can aspire to Abraham's unique position, not even
Job.

*18 This line
intended to
be added*

An attempt to solve the problem presented
by the obvious change in attitude towards Job

reflected in the above sources, was made by Kohler, whose theory has been developed in more recent years by R. Sander.⁵⁰ The portrayal of Job as we find it in the Testament, Kohler argues, was a product of the Hellenistic era, which, with its broad-minded and cosmopolitan tendencies, allowed for the glorification of non-Israelite figures such as Adam, Noah, Enoch and Malchizedek. Subsequent persecutions at the hands of pagans, however, produced a negative attitude towards the pre-Abrahamic patriarchs from Maccabaeen times onwards. Thus, Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai, living under the strictures of Roman oppression, declared that the pagan Job served God out of fear, not love. By denigrating Job in favour of Abraham, Kohler suggests, that the Rabbis sought to protect the Hebrew patriarch from the possible rivalry of a heathen saint.

Two observations may be made regarding this theory. Firstly, it does not constitute a full solution to the problem of the decline in attitude towards Job generally in talmudic-midrashic literature, as Kohler intended. We will endeavour to show subsequently that the increasing antagonism towards Job in the amoraic period was due to

external pressures of which Kohler had no knowledge. Secondly, his theory is based upon the widely-accepted assumption that אהבה and יראה simply denote two degrees of piety, the former being superior to the latter. In view of Finkelstein's observations on the subject of love and fear for God, this assumption can no longer stand unchallenged.⁵¹ אהבה and יראה, according to Finkelstein, were not simply contrasting virtues, but represent conflicting ideals which divided the two wings of Pharisaic Judaism, the Hillelites and the Shammaites. While the former upheld אהבה as the highest principle in the service of God, the latter, in keeping with their general sociological and theological outlook, regarded יראה, awe, or reverence, as the basis of the relationship between the mortal servant and his Divine Master. The implications of Finkelstein's theory for our Mishnah above, are of some interest. Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai, a leading Hillelite teacher, in declaring Job to have served God out of fear, presumably regarded him as a scriptural prototype for the ideology of his opponents. This view is echoed in the ancient Baraita mentioned above, which, in Finkelstein's opinion, has been modified to conform with Hillelite teaching,⁵² where Job

actually appears as the פרוש יראה, viz. the Shammaite. However, is there any evidence in our sources to suggest that Job was a popular figure in Shammaite circles, and might, therefore, have been identified with their ideology by their Hillelite opponents? Such evidence is not entirely lacking, if we accept Finkelstein's view that the earlier sections of Abhoth d'Rabbi Nathan are based upon an original Shammaite document, which has been more faithfully preserved in Version A.⁵³ For this source is unique in talmudic-midrashic literature for the consistent manner in which it portrays Job in a favourable light, lauding his austere piety⁵⁴ and his excellent moral qualities.⁵⁵ The Vatican Manuscript of this recension is even more remarkable, as it preserves a lengthy homily on Job which clearly presupposes the picture of this personality as found in the Testament of Job.⁵⁶ One parallel between this homily and the Testament of Job which is particularly noteworthy, is the allusion to Job's activity as a philanthropic missionary,⁵⁷ which is emphatically denied in the main text of Version A, as we observed above. It is conceivable, therefore, that Job was admired in Shammaite circles, where the ancient traditions relating to him were more carefully preserved. However, with the re-emergence

of the martyr-ideal in the second century, and its identification with the Hillelite concept of love for God, Job was reclaimed by the teachers at Yabneh, for whom the partisan attitudes of the preceding generations were no longer a determining factor.

In keeping with this theory, it may be possible to offer an alternative explanation to that advanced by Kohler for the tendency in early sources to contrast the qualities of Job with those of Abraham. It is conceivable that the Hillelites, while identifying Job with the teachings and principles of their opponents, claimed the patriarch Abraham as the representative of their ideology, as is suggested by the Baraita of the seven Pharisaic types.⁵⁸ Consequently, those sources which assert Abraham's excellence over Job may emanate from Hillelite circles where these two personalities were employed to express in figurative terms, the superiority of Hillelite over Shammaite ideals.

IV. Job in Amoraic Sources

The early image of Job as a saintly and pious figure did not disappear entirely in amoraic times. Some knowledge of the old tradition regarding

Job's beneficence and generosity evidently survived.⁵⁹
 R. Johanan b. Nappaḥa in particular, held Job in the highest esteem, declaring that the Bible had credited him with even greater qualities than those of the patriarch, Abraham:⁶⁰ אמר ר' יוחנן: גדול הנאמר באיוב יותר ממה שנ' באברהם, דאילו באברהם כתיב "כי עתה ידעתי כי ירא אלקים אתה". ובאיוב כתיב "איש תם וישר ירא אלקים וסר מרע". ("R. Johanan said: That which is said of Job in the Bible is greater than that which is said of Abraham! For in the case of Abraham it is written, 'For now I know that you are a God-fearing man (Gen. 22:12)', while in the case of Job it is written, 'A whole-hearted and upright man, one who fears God and shuns evil (Job 1:8)'.").

However, R. Johanan's lofty appraisal of Job in this passage is completely contrary to the general tendency in amoraic sources. From a number of statements by later teachers, it is clear that the attitude towards Job in the post-tannaitic period underwent a radical change. This is reflected particularly in comments relating to the respective qualities of Job and Abraham. In amoraic sources, Job is no longer a secondary figure, pious and God-fearing, but totally inferior to the patriarch, any similarity between the two personalities being persistently denied. Moreover,

the particular target selected by later teachers for their criticism of Job, is the virtue for which he was so highly esteemed in early times, his endurance in the face of trial and suffering. The early picture of Job as a martyr-figure, willingly accepting his fate, is entirely obscured, and Job appears as an unstable figure, rebelling against God when put to the test. According to R. Hanina

b. Pappa, this rebelliousness of spirit caused Job to forfeit the great dignity of being accounted

among the patriarchs: כיון שבאו יסורים על איוב אילו כבש כעסו ולא קרא תגר אחר מידת הדין, למידה גדולה ומשובחת היה בא. א'ר חנינא בר פפא: אילו לא קרא תגר, כשם שאומרים עכשיו בתפילה „אלקי אברהם אלקי יצחק ואלקי יעקב“, כך היו אומרים „אלקי איוב“, שעצה נטל הקב'ה לעיני קדושים של מעלן אמר להן: איוב עבדי זה ד' מידות גדולים יש בו „איש תם וישר ירא אלקים וסר מרע“, יגיעו אותו כל אילו היסורים, אם עומד בהם ולא קורא תגר [מיחד] (מיחל) אני שמי עליו כשם [שיחדתי] (שיחלתי) על האבות. לא עשה אלא כיון שהגיעו אותו יסורים התחיל מבעט ואומר „מי יתן ידעתי ואמצאהו“. מיד אמר לו הקב'ה: הא איוב החשכת

Had Job suppressed his anger

עצה שנטלתי למעלן.

when afflictions came upon him, and had not

protested against Divine Justice, he would have

achieved a great and praiseworthy rank! R. Hanina

b. Pappa said: Had he not protested, then just as we now say in the 'Amidah, 'The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob', so we would have added

'the God of Job'. For God took counsel with the Holy Ones above saying, 'My servant Job possesses four great attributes, he is "a whole-hearted and upright man, one who fears God and shuns evil (Job 1:1)". Let all these afflictions come upon him, if he withstands them and does not complain, I will confer my name upon him, as I have done with the patriarchs!'. But Job did not do so. Once the afflictions came upon him, he began to kick and say, 'O that I knew where I might find Him, that I might come even unto His seat, etc... (ibid. 23:2)'. Immediately God said to him, 'O Job, you have frustrated the counsel which I took above!'.⁶¹

According to R. Hanina b. Pappa, the superiority of the patriarchs over Job was their ability to withstand the afflictions of God, for which they merited the distinction of bearing God's name.⁶² In the following statement in the name of R. Berechiah, Abraham in particular is presented as the superior of Job, because of his surpassing forbearance. In answer to Job's question, "Why am I not like Abraham?", R. Berechiah put into the mouth of Eliphaz the following answer: סבור אתה שהוא משוה אותך לו?..... וכי מעשך כאברהם הם? הנסה דבר אליך תלאה וגו' ", אברהם נתנסה בעשר נסיונות ועמד בכולן, ואתה בנסיון אחד הנסה דבר אליך תלאה.....?".

("Do you think that He compares you to him?!
Are your deeds like Abraham's? 'If He tests you in
a single thing, you will be weary!', Abraham was
tested on ten occasions, and stood firm in all of
them! You have been tested but once, 'He has tested
you in a single thing, yet you are weary!'").⁶³

A further comment on Job's rashness of
character as compared with the balanced conduct of
Abraham, is made by the Amora R. Levi. Both these
personalities voiced their thoughts concerning God's
justice, and thereby displayed the difference in
their respective characters: אמר ר' לוי: הוא הדבר שאמר
אברהם הוא הדבר שאמר איוב, אלא איוב בלעה פגה אבל אברהם
בלעה בשילה. איוב אמר "אחת היא על כן אמרתי הם ורשע הוא
מכלה", אבל אברהם אמר "האף תספה צדיק עם רשע".....

("R. Levi said: Job and Abraham made a similar
statement, but Job spoke rashly, while Abraham spoke
with deliberation. Job said, 'It is all one, there-
fore I say He destroys the innocent and the wicked
(Job 9:22)'. While Abraham said, 'Will you destroy
the righteous with the wicked (Gen. 18:24)?' ").⁶⁴

While Kohler may be correct in associating
this marked change in attitude towards Job in
rabbinic circles with a similar decline in the
position of the pre-Abrahamic patriarchs,⁶⁵ his

assumption that this tendency arose purely from nationalistic considerations is untenable. More recent scholarship has shown that the unfavourable attitude towards these early biblical figures in talmudic-midrashic sources is to be associated with their prominence in early Christian teachings. It is possible, therefore, that Job's decline in rabbinic circles may also be due to Christian interest in him. As Christianity in its early phase was a martyr faith, it is understandable that the image of Job as a suffering saint may have held some special appeal for the early teachers of the Church, as it did for R. Joshua b. Hyrkanos and his contemporaries. Thus in the New Testament itself, Job's patient suffering is offered to the faithful as an example which they should emulate.⁶⁶ The early Church Father, Clement of Alexandria, stresses Job's extraordinary self control, and the excellence of his faith amid the complete reversal of his fate.⁶⁷ it is interesting to note that within the same era when Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai relegated Job to a secondary position in the scale of Jewish ideals, on the basis of Job 1:1, Clement of Alexandria deduced from this same verse that Job's conduct proved him to be the example of the true "Gnostic",

viz. the highest Christian type.⁶⁸ Tertullian, Cyprian and Methodius all extol the patience of Job.⁶⁹ Cyprian in particular, whose words bear some resemblance to those of Akiba,⁷⁰ informs his followers that it is the fate of the Christian to suffer more in this world, therefore, they should follow the example of Job's patience in suffering without murmuring.

An important aspect of the Christian attitude towards Job is to be seen in the writings of two later Church Fathers who were actually domiciled in Palestine during the amoraic period. According to Jerome, Job is not merely the example for the suffering saint, but a prototype for Jesus himself, "the Athlete of the Church before the advent of Christ".⁷¹ This notion is developed further by Hesychius, presbyter of Jerusalem, who, once again, regarded Job as a prototype for Jesus, and expounds the whole Book of Job in his commentary as an allegory, foreshadowing Christ and the Church.⁷²

These sources are sufficient to indicate that the early Church attached some considerable importance to Job as an example for righteous conduct in suffering, and we may conclude, therefore, that this induced the rabbinic scholars to deny Job's qualities as a pious suffering saint, and to portray

him as a rebellious figure, vehemently resisting Divine visitation.

Christian sources, however, shed no light on the problem presented by the involvement of Abraham in Job's denigration in rabbinic sources. Although rabbinic literature contains further examples of biblical characters who figured in Jewish-Christian polemics, being contrasted with the patriarch,⁷³ it is to be noted that several of the above passages are as much in defence of Abraham as they are a criticism of Job. R. Hanina b. Pappa's graphic account of Job's failure to qualify for the dignity and the status of a patriarch, suggests that this idea may have been advocated in some circles. Similarly, R. Levi's insistence that Job's words are not to be compared with those of the patriarch, may have been an attempt to counteract such a suggestion which may have been current in his day. R. Levi betrays his concern for the prestige of Abraham, in his unusual interpretation of Satan's motives in inciting God against Job: "For when Satan saw that God was inclined towards Job, he said, 'Heaven forbid that He should forget Abraham's love for Him!'.⁷⁴"

Marmorstein has already observed that

God's choice of Abraham was subjected to criticism in Gnostic circles, which provoked a marked response from rabbinic scholars.⁷⁵ No external evidence has been preserved to show that Job, a pious victim of the Demiurge's malice, was seriously proposed by Gnostics as a possible rival to Abraham. Nor can it be established that the Book of Job, with its suggested criticism of the God-head, was of particular interest to Gnostic thinkers. However, in the event of such evidence ultimately coming to light, this possibility should remain open.

However, Christian interest in Job may help us to elucidate a further problem presented by talmudic-midrashic sources, the complex question of the dating of Job. He is ascribed to almost every period of biblical history by the Rabbis, but on closer examination, these widely differing views do reveal a definite pattern. Among the earlier teachers, when Job was esteemed as a martyr-figure, he is regarded either as a contemporary of the Egyptian bondage, and presumably a convert,⁷⁶ or as an Israelite, living in the post-Mosaic period of Israelite history.⁷⁷ However, from the end of the tannaitic period onwards, the tendency is to place Job in the patriarchal period, as a heathen who was

neither circumcised nor converted.⁷⁸ We may presume that this change of attitude regarding Job's historical setting was influenced by his growing prominence in Christian circles, which probably induced Resh Lakish to adopt the extreme view that Job did not exist at all.⁷⁹ On the other hand, Resh Lakish's contemporary and colleague, R. Johanan b. Nappaha, who still adhered to the favourable attitude of the earlier teachers towards Job, follows their tendency, insisting that Job was a Jew, and one of the founders of the Second Jewish Commonwealth.⁸⁰

Notes

1. From the extensive material quoted particularly by Sandmel (cf "Philo's Place in Judaism", HUCA XXVI, 1955, pp. 151-216) it is clear that the elaboration of the biblical story of Abraham began early in the pre-Christian era. However, it is equally clear from these sources that the development of the Abraham legend reached its climax in talmudic times when the patriarch emerged as the prototype for all the virtues admired by the Rabbis.

2. The text upon which this study is based is that published by K. Kohler with a translation and a detailed introduction, in "Semitic Studies in Memory of Alexander Kohut" Berlin 1897, pp. 264-338. See also M.R. James' edition of the Testament published on the basis of the Paris Manuscript, with an introduction, in "Apocrypha Anecdota", Cambridge 1897, pp. 104-137. A critical edition of the Testament prepared by S.P. Brock, was published in 1967 (Leiden, E.J. Brill = Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece, ed. A.M. Denis et M. de Jonge, 2) and is cited below in parenthesis.

3. Op. cit., p. 265.

4. Cf Torrey, "The Apocalyptic Literature", Yale 1945, pp. 140-145; also Pfeiffer, "History of New Testament Times", London 1949, p. 70ff. Both these scholars argue in favour of an Aramaic original for the Testament, predating the Septuagint to Job. An important factor in the dating of the Testament is the Aristeas Fragment, quoted after Alexander Polyhistor by Eusebius (see above, p. 36, note 11), which contains several traditions recorded in the Testament. It is possible to assume that both Aristeas and the author of the Testament drew their material from a common stock of traditions relating to Job, which were current in Hellenistic-Jewish circles. However, in view of our observations above, that the Testament is an early example of Jewish martyr-literature, it is conceivable that it has its origins during the wave of martyrdom at the time of the Syrian persecutions, and as such, may have been the source for Aristeas' information.

5. For a detailed analysis of the literary schemes of Jewish, Christian and pagan martyria, cf H.A. Fischel, "Martyr and Prophet", JQR (NS) XXXVII (1946-7), pp. 265-280, and 363-386, particularly pp. 383-4, where Fischel lists twenty-four literary

features of Jewish and Christian martyria with Hellenistic parallels; in subsequent notes, these are cited according to Fischel's numbering, along with the relevant passages from the Testament. For more recent observations on pagan martyriologies, see Herbert A. Musurillo, "The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs", Oxford 1954 (also "Acta Alexandrinorum de mortibus Alexandriae nobilium", Lipsiae 1961, by the same author); and briefly, R. Loewe, "A Jewish Counterpart to the Acts of the Alexandrines", JJS XII (1961), p. 107.

6. Cf 1:9ff, also vv. 19-21 (ed. Brock, 2:2; 4:3f, pp. 20 and 21; 1. The martyr receives foreknowledge of his death; see also Fischel op. cit., p. 369).

7. Cf 1:22, also 6:28-9 (ed. Brock, 4:5, and 27:3f, pp. 21 and 38).

8. Cf Fischel op. cit., p. 267; Charles, "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha" II, pp. 658 and 660.

9. See above, p. 64, and note 71 ad loc..

10. Cf 1:27 (see ed. Brock, 5:1, p. 22; 2. Refusal to flee).

11. Cf 5:4-9 (ed. Brock, 20:5f, p. 32f; 14. The tortures; 15. The martyr's strength of soul).

12. This graphic description of Job returning the worms to his own flesh - which occurs also in rabbinic sources (cf ARN ed. Schechter, p. 164) - was known also to Tertullian (cf "Of Patience" 14, ed. Migne I, p. 1270-71). A further description of Job's self-imposed afflictions, taken presumably from older sources, is recorded by Hai Gaon in his commentary to Miqwa'oth ix (cf Wertheimer, "Battei Midrashot", 2nd ed. II, p. 173): "שק תפרתי עלי גלדי", "אמר איוב: במנהגו של עולם מי שהיתה לו מכה ונתרפאה מעט והעלתה גלד, נותן בה דברים רכים כמו צמר גפן, או סרק של פשתן בריכוך השמן, אבל אני השק - שאינו רך אלא קשה - תפרתי על גלדי (השנה גם י.נ. אפשטיין, פרוש הגאונים, סדר. (122 'ע, טהרות, "I have sewn sackcloth upon my skin (Job 16:15)". Job said, 'Normally, someone who has a wound which has healed a little and has grown a skin, dresses it with soft things, like vine-wool, or combed flax with soothing ointment. But I 'have sewn sackcloth - which is not soft, but harsh - upon my skin!'").

13. Cf 6:26-30 (ed. Brock, 27:2-5, p. 38f; 17. The admiration of the executioner, or prosecutor.).

14. Cf 5:10 (ed. Brock, 21:2, p. 33; 18. The vision of the martyr.). The Testament is somewhat obscure at this point, and Kohler suggests that Job's vision is that of his children being carried into heaven by

angels (see 9:13, where Job sees them crowned like martyrs standing near the throne of God; on this imagery, which also occurs in Jewish and Christian sources, see Fischel *op. cit.*, p. 382). We may note further that, in keeping with Fischel's basic contention regarding the association between prophecy and martyrdom in this kind of literature, Job's prophetic powers are amplified in the Testament. He is credited with the prophetic experiences of other biblical personalities. Like Samuel, he is summoned by a voice in the night, which speaks to him from a flame as in the case of Moses (1:11, and 16, ed. Brock, 3:1, and 4:1, pp. 20 and 21. Some parallel between the personalities of Moses and Samuel is suggested in biblical sources, cf Psalms 99:6, מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן בְּכַהֲנֵי וְשִׁמְוֹאֵל בְּקֹרְאֵי שְׁמוֹ. Moreover, he has visions of the ultimate destruction in the eschatological period (7:36-39, ed. Brock, 33:4f, p. 43f).

15. Cf 7:1ff (ed. Brock, 28:2f, p. 39; 3. The publicity of the trial; see also Fischel's comments *op. cit.*, pp. 366 and 370). The tradition that Job's three friends were monarchs like himself, is found only in Hellenistic sources (viz. the Aristeas Fragment, and the Colophon to the LXX on Job), and

is without parallel in either rabbinic or biblical sources. It is possible that this tradition has its origins in the Testament itself, where, in the context of the martyr-legend of Job, the presentation of his three friends as kings has some significance, transforming his trial into a great public event. Moreover, in view of the notion expressed by Jerome that the "Athlete" Job was a prototype for Jesus (above, p. 64), it is interesting to note the parallel between the visit of Job's three royal friends and the three kings of the orient who come to pay homage to the infant Jesus.

16. Cf 10:9-12 (ed. Brock, 42:4-8, pp. 51-2), and see also the Targum to Job 2:11 (cited below, p. 399, note 24), which adds that Job's three friends were saved from the place reserved for them in Gehinnom through their visit to him.

17. Cf 10:14ff (ed. Brock, 43:5ff, p. 52). The damnation of Elihu is one of the most unusual features of the Testament, having no basis in the biblical Book of Job, and is virtually without parallel in rabbinic sources (see, however, R. Akiba's identification of Elihu with Balaam, PT Soṭah v, 20d). In all probability, the death of Elihu, who is characterised in the Testament as the mortal

representative of Satan, Job's accuser and torturer, is the counterpart of the death of the tyrant in other martyr stories. Presumably, as Satan himself cannot die, the author of the Testament has substituted the death and damnation of Elihu as the climax of Job's trial. Unfortunately, he does not elaborate upon Elihu's persecution of Job, but merely refers to a record of his speeches (10:7, ed. Brock, 41:5, p. 51), indicating that the author himself drew the material for his work from even earlier sources.

18. Cf 12:19, also 1:26 (ed. Brock, pp. 59 and 22; 21. The pronouncement of immortality).

19. P. 100ff

20. Cf particularly R. Sander, "Furcht und Liebe im Palaestinensischen Judentum", Stuttgart 1935; also A. Büchler, "Studies in Sin and Atonement", London 1928, p. 119ff. See further the interesting observations of J. Amir on Philo's usage of these two terms, "Philo's Homilies in Love and Fear and their relationship to Palestinian Midrashim", Zion XXX (1965), pp. 47-60.

21. Cf Midrash Tannaim, ed. Hoffmann p. 73-4. See also the alternative proof-texts offered by

R. Joshua b. Hananiah's contemporary, Ben Paturi, and by R. Akiba's pupil, R. Nathan, Tosephta Soṭah 6:1 (ed. Zuckermann, p. 303); PT Soṭah v, 20c; on R. Nathan, see further note 26, p. 77 below.

22. Cf S. Holdheim, "Ma'amar Ha-Ishuth", Berlin 1861, p. 98, where he endeavours to explain Rabban Joḥanan's view in terms of an anti-Sadducean polemic. However, see Büchler's critical remarks on this theory, op. cit., p. 134ff. In Büchler's own opinion, the views recorded in this source may reflect a dispute between the Schools of Hillel and Shammai, while the former upheld the view that Job served God out of love, the latter adhered to the "stricter" opinion that Job's motives were conditioned by fear. Although Büchler may be substantially correct in associating the conflicting opinions in Mishnah with an ideological dispute between the Hillelite and Shammaite factions - as we shall endeavour to prove - his interpretation of their conflicting attitudes in relationship to the terms הבטח and הבטח', must be revised in the light of more recent scholarship. See further the unsatisfactory attempt of J. Neusner to interpret the contents of this Mishnah ("The Life of Rabban Joḥanan b. Zaccai", Leiden 1962, pp. 96-7).

23. Op. cit., p. 150-1.

24. Cf the Baraita in Berakhoth 61b. In Sifre Deut. 32, p. 73a, this statement occurs anonymously, while in Tosephta Berakhoth vii, ed. Zuckerman, p. 15, it is recorded in the name of R. Meir. However, see further Finkelstein, Sifre ad loc. p. 55.

25. Cf Sifre loc.cit., also Tosephta Berakhoth loc.cit.; and see further, Bacher, "Die Agada der Tannaiten" I, p. 418, note 2.

26. Ibid., כיצחק שעקד עצמו על גבי המזבח. For further examples of the interpretation of אהבה in terms of martyrdom by teachers of this generation, cf Mechilta Beshallah, Shirta iii, ed. Friedmann, p. 37a, where R. Akiba applies Cant 1:3 to the martyrs of his era: ר' עקיבא אומר: אדבר בנאותיו ושבתיו: של הקב"ה בפני כל אומות העולם, שהרי אומות העולם שואלין את ישראל "מה דורך מדוד שככה השבעתנו (שה' ה, 9) - שכן אתם מתים לעולם עליו וכן אתם נהרגין עליו, שנאמר "על כן עלמות אהבוך" - אהבוך עד מות.

Similarly, R. Joshua b. Jonathan saw in Cant. 1:4, an allusion to the superlative love of Tinius Rufus' victims ('Aggadath Shir ha-Shirim to 1:4, ed. Schech. p. 351): "משרים אהבוך", ר' יהושע בן יונתן היה אומר: על מי שהרגן טורנוס רופוס הרשע: הרבה אהבו אותך מן הצדיקים הראשונים. Finally, R. Nathan saw in his martyred contemporaries the example for the "lovers"

ר' נתן אומר: "לאוהבי of God as implied in Ex. 20:6: ולשומרי מצותי" - אלו ישראל שהם יושבים בארץ ישראל ונותנים נפשם על המצות (מכיל' יתרו, בחדש ו, ס' ח ע'ב).

27. Op. cit., p. 151.

28. Cf Shab. 33b, R. Shimon b. Yoḥai's reaction to the normality of the world to which he returned:

אסור לאדם שימלא שחוק פיו. Compare also his remarks in Berakh. 31a: מניחין חיי עולם ועוסקין בחיי שעה. See further R. Meir's characterisation of this world as a place of night (Koh. R. to 7:18): "ליני הלילה (רות ג' 13) - בעולם שכולו לילה. Compare also Mechilta ibid., p. 33b; Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yoḥai, p. 70. See further the declaration of R. Nehorai (Mishnah Kiddushin 4:14), that the study of the Torah is the only valid occupation to be undertaken in this world: מניח אני את כל אומנות ואיני מלמד את בני אלא תורה שאדם אוכל משכרה בעוה'ז, והקרן קיימת לעולם הבא.

29. Cf Sifre Deut. 32, p. 73b: ר' ש בן יוהאי אומר: חביבים יסורים ששלש מתנות נתן הקב"ה להן לישראל שאומות העולם מתאחים להם ולא נתנוהו לישראל אלא על ידי יסורים ואלו הם, תורה וארץ ישראל והעולם הבא. מניין? שנאמר "כי נר מצוה ותורה אור, ודרך חיים תוכחות מוסר (משלי ו, 23)", איזהו דרך שמביא את האדם לעוה'ב? הוי אומר זה יסורים (השחה גם מכילתא יתרו שם, י, 73).

30. Cf Sifre loc. cit.: ר' נחמי' אומר: חביבים יסורים כשם שהקרבות מרצים כן יסורים מרצים. . . . ועוד שהיסורים

מרצים יותר מהקרבנות, שהקרבנות בממונו, ויסורים בגוף,
וכן הוא אומר "עוד בעד עוד וכל אשר לאיש יתן בעד נפשו
(איוב ב' 4. השחה מכילתא שם)".

Also GR 33:1, ed. T-A, p. 299: "צדקתך כהררי אל משפטיך: תהום רבה אדם ובהמה תושיע ה' (תה' ל' ו' 7)..." ר' עקיבא
אומר: אלו ואלו מדקדק עמהם עד תהום רבה, מדקדק עם
הצדיקים וגובה מהם מיעוט מעשים רעים שעשו בעוה'ז כדי
להשפיע להם שלווה וליתן להם שכר טוב לעוה'ב, משפיע
שלווה לרשעים ונותן להם שכר מצות קלות שעשו בעוה'ז כדי
להפרע להם לעתיד לבוא.

Compare also R. Akiba's statement in Tanh. Buber I,
p. 34: אמר ר' עקיבא: צדקה שאתה עושה לנו לעולם הבא
בשביל שאנו קבלנו משפטיך בעולם הזה.

ר' א' בן יעקוב אומר: 31. Cf Sifre Deut., loc. cit.:
הרי הוא אומר "את אשר יאהב ה' יוכיח וכאב את הבן ירצה
(משלי ג' 12)", מי גרם לבן שירצה לאב? הוי אומר "יסורים
(השחה מכילתא שם)".

Also Tanhuma (OV) Ki Thezei, 2: צריך אדם להחזיק טובה
לקדוש ברוך הוא בזמן שה"סורין באין עליו, למה?
שה"סורין מושכין את האדם לקדוש ברוך הוא.

We can discern in R. Eliezer b. Jacob's statement the
influence of his master, Akiba, who declared that God
is to be blessed for whatever measure of treatment He
metes out to a man, as is exemplified by Job (Sifre

ר' עקיבא (השחה מדרש תנאים ע' 26, מכילתא: loc. cit.):
שם, ילקוט דברים תתל'ז) אומר: אם נאמר "בכל נפשך" קל
וחומר "בכל מאדך", אלא בכל מדה ומדה שהוא מודד לך בין
במדת הטוב בין במדת הפורענות וכן איוב אומר "ה'
נתן וה' לקח יהי שם ה' מבורך (אי' א' 21)" - על מדת
הטוב קו'ח על מדת הפורענות. מה אשתו א'ל? "עודך מחזיק

בתומתך? בָּרַךְ אֱלֹקִים וּמַת (שם ב' 9) ". ומה אמר לה? "כדבר
אחת הנבלות תדברי גם את הטוב נקבל מאת האֱלֹקִים ואת הרע
לא נקבל? (שם 10) ". אנשי דור המבול היו כעורים בטובה,
וכשבאה עליהם פורענות קבלוה בעל כרחם. והלא דברים
קו'ח? ומה אם מי שהוא כעור בטובה נאה בפורענות, כל
שכן מי שהוא נאה בטובה שיהא נאה בפורענות?
הוא שאמר לה "כדבר אחת הנבלות תדברי אם הטוב נקבל מאת
האלקים ואת הרע לא נקבל?".

Moreover, Akiba continues, a man should rejoice more
at the advent of afflictions, because of their
atoning power: ועוד יהי אדם שמח בייסורין יותר מן הטובה:
שאילו אדם בטובה כל ימיו אין נמחל לו עון שבידו, ובמה
נמחל לו? בייסורין נמחל לו.

See also Akiba's comment on the difference between
Israel's reaction to suffering and that of the
nations of the world (Mechilta Jethro 10, p. 72b):
כשהטובה באה עליהם (האומות) הם מכבדין את אלהיהם.....
וכשהפורענות באה עליהן הם מקללין את אלהיהם.....
אבל אתם אם אביא עליכם את הטובה תנו הודאה, וכשאביא
עליכם ייסורים תנו הודאה.

Similarly, Akiba's pupil, Judah b. 'Ila'i, describes
the praises of the righteous and their thankfulness
for the afflictions sent upon them in this world
(Lev. R. 32:1): בשעה שהצדיקים יוצאים מתוך גן עדן
באותה שעה נותנין שבה והודאה להקב"ה על הייסורין שהביא
In conclusion we may note the
anonymous Baraita which may have its origins in this
same period, in which the lovers of God are
characterised by their ability to suffer their

humiliation silently, and to rejoice amid their afflictions (Shab. 88b; Git. 36b): תנו רבנן: עלובין ואינן עולבין שומעין חרפתן ואין משיבין, עושין מאהבה ושמחין ביסורין, עליהן הכתוב אומר "ואוהביו כצאת השמש בגבורתו (שופטים ה' 31)".

32. Cf PT Berakh. ix, 14b; Berakh. 61b; PT Soṭah v, 20c.

33. We already find a number of the extreme notions expressed by Akiba and his contemporaries in the statements of first generation Tannaim who witnessed the first struggle with Rome in 66CE. Like R. Nehorai (above, note 28), Nehuniah b. ha-Kana saw in the study of the Law an escape from wordly¹ cares and responsibilities (cf Abhoth 3:5). Nahum of Gimzo was clearly the forerunner of his pupil Akiba in stressing the virtue of suffering and afflictions

סליק לגביה (PT Shekal. v, 49b; also Ta'an. 21a): (לנחום איש גמזו) ר' עקיבה, א'ל: אי לי שאני רואה אותך כן. א'ל: אי לי שאין אני רואה אותך כן. א'ל: מה את מקלל(ו)ני? א'ל: ומה את מבט ביסורין?

Similarly, R. Eleazar b. R. Zadok, who witnessed the final destruction of Jerusalem, characterised suffering as the means by which the righteous inherit the world to come (cf Kid. 40b; also ARN Vers. A, xxxix, p. 119, and compare notes 29-30 above). A particularly striking parallel for the statements of

Akiba and his contemporaries is to be found in the Apocalypse of Baruch (52:5-7):

"As for the righteous, what will they do now? Rejoice ye in the suffering which ye now suffer Make ready your souls for that which is reserved for you, for the reward which is laid up for you".

There is also evidence in pre-Christian sources to suggest that such notions were developed at an even earlier period, and could, conceivably, have their origins during the first period of Jewish martyrdom at the time of the Maccabees. Job's declaration quoted above from the Testament (p. 43), clearly foreshadows the ideal of Akiba and his associates. We may note in addition several passages from the Psalms of Solomon which once again bear a striking resemblance to the utterances of the teachers at Yabneh nearly two centuries later. According to the psalmist, those who love God are characterised by their ability to abide His chastening (14:1). When smitten by God, the righteous man must continually demonstrate his pleasure before the Lord (3:4; compare above, p. 80, עוֹשֵׂי מַעֲלָה, וְשִׂמְחִין בְּיָסוּרֵין). "Blessed is the man - the psalmist declares - whom the Lord remembereth with

reproving ... that he may be cleansed from his sin (10:1-2, and compare above, note 30, p. 77)".

34. E.g. Isaac, the three friends of Daniel; on the development of new martyr-figures, see Fischel's observations op. cit., p. 273f; see also E. Urbach on the emergence of Abraham as a martyr-figure, in "Ascesis and Suffering in Talmudic and Midrashic Sources", Baer Jubilee Volume, Jerusalem 1960, p. 59. As Urbach observes, Abraham's trial in the fiery furnace is unknown in both rabbinic and non-rabbinic sources predating the Bar Kokhba period, which suggests that this aspect of the Abraham-figure was developed during the period of the Hadrianic persecutions.

35. 1:27.

36. See above, note 31; also Additional Note II, below p. 113f.

37. Cf Sotah 31a: נאמר ירא אלקים באיוב, ונאמר ירא אלקים באברהם (בר' כ' ב 12), מה ירא אלקים האמור באברהם מאהבה אף ירא אלקים האמור באיוב מאהבה (גמרא: אברהם גופיה מנלן? דכת' "זרע אברהם אוהבי (יש' מ' א 8)".).

We may note further that R. Meir's statement has a wider significance as it constitutes one of the earliest allusions in rabbinic sources to a

concept which was to be accepted by subsequent Jewish tradition, that the ideal attitude in the service of God is a combination of both אהבה and יראה. This concept, reflected in Jewish liturgy (see for example, Singer's P.B., new ed., p. 41: ויחזר וישם בלבנו ; also p. 77: לבבנו לאהבה וליראה שמך (אהבתו ויראתו)), is found for the first time in rabbinic sources, in the statements of teachers of the post-Bar Cochba period. Thus R. Nathan, R. Meir's contemporary, declared (PT Soṭah v, 20c): ועשה מיראה, עשה מאהבה שאם באתה לשנוא דע שאת אוהב ואין אוהב שונא, עשה מיראה שאם באתה לבעט דע שאין ירא מבעט. R. Nathan's statement, however, like that of R. Meir, is somewhat obscure. A more explicit definition of the nature of this combination between אהבה and יראה in the service of God, was advanced by R. Judah b. Tema. "Love and fear heaven - he declares - trembling and rejoicing in the performance of all the Mizwoth! (הוי אוהב את השמים וירא מן השמים, חרד ; ARN Vers. A, li p. 133; see also Derekh 'Erez Zuṭṭa 1:1). We see, therefore, that the trembling induced by יראה was conceived as having a restraining effect upon the excessive joy stimulated by אהבה, a notion which occurs also in later sources. In TBA 3, ed. Friedmann p. 13, David is depicted as declaring, "My fear permeates my

joy, and my joy permeates my fear, my love pervading over all! (.... יראתי בתוך שמחתי ושמחתי בתוך יראתי) (ואהבתי על כולן). Similarly, in connection with Mishnah Berakhoth 5:1, אין עומדין להתפלל אלא מתוך כבוד ראש במקום גילה, עבדו את ה' ביראה וגילו ברעדה, as (cf Berakh. 30b; PT Berakh. v, 8d; also Yoma 4b).

Although this notion occurs only in late tannaitic, and amoraic sources, it may be of high antiquity. The restraining effect of fear upon excessive gladness is suggested already in the pre-Christian Testament of Judah (16:2, "If ye drink wine in gladness be ye modest in the fear of the Lord"). Of particular significance, however, is a lengthy homily by Philo on the subject of love and fear, which has been based, presumably, on contemporary Palestinian Aggadah (cf "Quis Haeres Sit", vi 19ff, and Amir op. cit. p. 55ff). Philo expounds the view that the ideal relationship with God, as exemplified by Abraham and Moses, is based upon a bold intimacy (= love), which is qualified by an awesome sense of restraint. It is possible that an echo of Philo's homily is preserved in our sources, in the curious statement recorded anonymously in Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai (p. 31),

that God's fear rests in greater measure upon those who enjoy a greater intimacy with Him: מוראו על

מוראו על (for further parallels for Philo's homily in rabbinic literature, see below, p. 128ff and notes 49, and 53-5).

38. See above, p. 48, and note 26 ad loc..

39. R. Ishmael clearly expresses his opposition to the martyr ideal in his exposition of Lev. 18:5, וְהָיָה

וְהָיָה (Sifra 'Aḥarei, p. 86a; also San. 74a and AZ 27b; see further the opposing interpretation of this verse, which gained wide currency, Sifra 85b, also both Targumim to Lev. ad loc.). Similarly, R. Ishmael opposed the tendency among his contemporaries to negate this world in favour of the next, by his exhortation to encourage the people to engage in worldly activities: הִנְהֵג בָהֶם

הִנְהֵג בָהֶם (Baraita in Berakhoth 35b on Deut. 11:14; also PT Pe'ah i, 15c: וְזוֹ - וְזוֹ (אומנות).

40. See above, p. 38, note 14.

41. Cf. PT Soṭah loc. cit.; also GR 57:4 (ed. T-A, p. 618); see further BB 15b: תָּנִי ר' חִיָּה: הִיא לִי בְּעוֹלָמִי גוֹי אֶחָד צָדִיק וְנִתְתִּי לוֹ שָׂכָרוֹ וּפְטָרְתִּיו מִעוֹלָמִי.

42. Cf Soṭah 11a: אֲרִי חֵיָּא בַר אַבָּא אֲרִי סִימָא: שְׁלֹשָׁה הָיוּ

באותה עצה, בלעם ואיוב ויתרו. בלעם שיעץ נהרג, איוב
שחק נידון ביסורין, יתרו שנרח זכו מבני בניו שיסבו
בלשכת הגזית.....

43. See above, p. 40, and note 1 ad loc..

44. Cf PT Soṭah loc.cit.; also PT Berakhoth ix, 14b:

שבעה פרושים הן..... פרוש יראה כאיוב, ופרוש אהבה
כאברהם, אין לך חביב מכולן אלא פרוש אהבה כאברהם.
אברהם עשה יצר רע טוב, ומה טעמא? „ומצאת את לבבו נאמן
לפניך (נח' ט' 8)“.

45. Cf Vers. A vii, p. 33-4; also Vers. B xiv, ibid.:

(יוסף בן יוחנן איש ירושלים אומר...) ויהיו עניים בני
ביתך (אבות א' 5): ולא בני ביתך ממש אלא שיהיו עניים
משיחין מה שאוכלין ושותין בתוך ביתך כדרך שהיו עניים
משיחין מה שאוכלין ושותין בתוך ביתו של איוב וכשנפגשו
זה בזה אמר אחד לחברו: מאין אתה בא? מתוך ביתו של איוב.
ולאן אתה הולך? לביתו של איוב. וכשבא עליו ההוא פורענות
גדול אמר לפני הקב"ה: רבוננו של עולם, לא הייתי מאכיל
רעבים ומשקה צמאים? שנ' „ואוכל פתי לבדי ולא אכל יתום
ממנה? (איוב ל' 16)“, ולא הייתי מלביש ערומים שנ'
„ומגז כבשי יתחמם? (שם 20)“. אעפ"כ א"ל הקב"ה לאיוב:
איוב, עדיין לא הגעת לחצי שיעור של אברהם! אתה יושב
ושוהה בתוך ביתך ואורחין נכנסים אצלך, את שדרכו לאכול
פת חטים האכלתו פת חטים, את שדרכו לאכול בשר האכלתו
בשר, את שדרכו לשתות יין השקיתו יין. אבל אברהם לא עשה
כן, אלא יוצא ומהדר בעולם וכשימצא אורחין מכניסן
בתוך ביתו, את שאין דרכו לאכול פת חטים האכילתו פת
חטים, את שאין דרכו לאכול בשר האכילתו בשר, ואת שאין
דרכו לשתות יין השקהו יין. ולא עוד אלא עמד ובנה
פלטורין גדולים על הדרכים והניח שם מאכל ומשתה וכל
הבא ונכנס אכל ושתה וברך לשמים, לפיכך נעשית לו נחת
רוח.....

See further note 56 below.

46. Cf chapter iii (ed. Brock, chap. 9f, p. 24ff), particularly verses 35-6 (14:2-3, p. 28): "And I took the cithara, and the widows responded after their meals. And with the musical instrument I reminded them of God that they should give praise to the Lord."

47. Cf Sifre Deut. 32, p. 73a: "וְאֶהְבֶּתָּ אֶת ה' אֱלֹקֶיךָ.... אֶהְבֶּהוּ עַל כָּל הַבְּרִיּוֹת כְּאַבְרָהָם אֲבִיךָ, כַּעֲנִיַן שֵׁן 'וְאֵת הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ בַחֲרֹן (בֶּר' י' ב' 5)", וְהִלָּא אִם מַתְכַּנְסִים כָּל בָּאֵי עוֹלָם לִבְרָאוֹת יְתוֹשׁ אֶחָד וְלִהְכַּנִּים בּוֹ נִשְׁמָה, אֵינָן יְכוּלִים לִבְרָאוֹתוֹ, וְמָה תִּלְמֹד לֹמֵר 'וְאֵת הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ בַחֲרֹן' ? אֵלָּא מִלְּמַד שֶׁהִיא אַבְרָהָם אֲבִינוּ מִגִּי'רָם וּמִכְנִיסָן תַּחַת כְּנָפֵי הַשְּׂכִינָה.

48. The actual expression employed in the Testament is "Abraham Thy friend" = אַבְרָהָם אוֹהֶבְךָ (cf Mech. Shir. x, p. 44a; also Sifre Numbers 42, p. 12b top; and compare Is. 41:8). In Ginzberg's opinion, the expression אוֹהֵב was largely replaced in post-biblical Hebrew by the term יָדִיד (cf "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 207-8, note 4). We should note however, that the expression "lover of God" continued to be used in connection with Abraham as well as the term "friend", as can be seen from Jubilees 17:18, and the writings of Philo (cf Sandmel op. cit., p. 165, note 130). Moreover, in view of the special significance attached to Abraham in early rabbinic sources as an עוֹבֵד מֵאֲהָבָה, or פָּרוֹשׁ אֲהָבָה, it is

highly probable that the epithet אֱלֹהִים did persist in connection with this personality (see further Büchler op. cit., p. 127-8, note 2; and compare the fragmentary Targum to Gen. 18:17, המכסה אני מאברהם : המכסי אנא מאברהם רחמי (= אברהם אלהי) .

49. Cf the longer recension, chapter xv, end (trans. G.H. Box, London 1927, p. 26-7; on the dating of this work, see Box op. cit., p. xxviii f; also Kohler, "The Pre-Talmudic Aggadah", JQR (OS) VII, pp. 581-606; and Ginzberg, "Testament of Abraham", JE I, pp. 93-6): "And the archangel (= Michael) said: '.... for from the beginning he is Thy friend, and all things pleasing in Thy sight he has done, neither is there any man like unto him upon the earth, no, not even Job the marve¹leous man.'". It is worthy of note that the Testament of Abraham, which may be our earliest source for the tendency to assert Abraham's supremacy over Job, is also our earliest record for the tradition of Abraham's philanthropic activities (see below, p. 105), which are employed to demonstrate Abraham's superiority over Job in the homily cited from ARN (above, note 45). It is possible, therefore, that these sources are contemporary, emanating from the same circle. It is interesting to note, therefore, by way of

contrast, the declaration of Satan in the lengthy homily preserved in the Vatican MS of ARN, discussed above (p. 57), which still preserves the tradition of Job as the philanthropic missionary, as we find him in the Testament of Job (see notes 46 and 56).

"I have wandered throughout the entire world - Satan declares - and I have found no man more beloved

הלך סטן ואמר לפני: "before you than Job alone!
הקב'ה: רבוננו של עולם שטתי בכל העולם כולו ולא מצאתי אדם
[אהוב] (אוהב) לפניך אלא איוב בלבד, ואתה העדות עליו ג'
פעמים "איש תם וישר ירא אלקים וסר מרע".....

Satan's dialogue with God in this source is clearly an amplification of the biblical text in Job 1:6ff. We can assume that this biblical testimony to Job's spiritual pre-eminence presented no small difficulty to those who sought to promote Abraham's superiority over Job. It is possible, therefore, that the following unusual exposition of these verses, in which Satan, Abraham's traditional enemy, emerges as the defender of his unequalled virtues, represents an attempt on the part of Abraham's protagonists to defend his supremacy against God's expressed favour for Job (cf BB 15b, and compare R. Levi's comment on

ויהי היום ויבאו בני האלהים להתיצב על ה' ויבא גם השטן בתוכם. ויאמר ה'
אל השטן מאין הבא? ויען השטן את ה' ויאמר משוט בארץ
ומהתהלך בה", אמר לפניו, רבש'ע שטתי בכל העולם כולו ולא
מצאתי נאמן כעבדך אברהם שאמרת לו "קום התהלך בארץ לארכה

ולרחבה כי לך אתונה (בר' י' ג 17), ואפילו הכי בשעה
שלא מצא מקום לקבור את שרה עד שקנה בד' מאות שקל כסף,
לא הרהר אחר מדות'ך. Although preserved only in

a Babylonian source, this exposition of Job 1:6-7 may
be very early as it reflects pre-rabbinic Aggadah.
Our unknown teacher evidently regarded the death of
Sarah, and Abraham's unquestioning acceptance of
the difficulty involved in procuring a burial place
in a land promised to him, as the supreme
affirmation of his faith. While this notion is
contrary to the general tendency in rabbinic Aggadah
where the 'Akedhah is depicted as Abraham's greatest
trial, it is fully in accord with the view
expressed in the second century BCE, by the author
of Jubilees, whose words form a striking parallel
with our passage above (19:9): "And he said not a
single word regarding the rumour in the land how
that God had said that He would give it to him, and
he begged a place to bury his dead; for he was found
faithful and was recorded on the heavenly tables as
the friend of God (= אֱוֹהֵב אֱלֹקִים)". See further
Jub. 17:18, where, following an account of seven of
the traditional ten trials experienced by Abraham,
the author continues, "and in everything wherein He
tried him, he was found faithful and a lover of the
Lord"; compare also the Baraita of the seven
Pharisaic types cited above, note 44, where Abraham

as the פרוש אהבה, exemplifies faithfulness of heart through the suppression of his passions.

50. See above, note 20.

51. See "Introduction to the Treatises Abot and Abot of R. Nathan", p. 32ff.

52. Ibid..

53. Op. cit., pp. 2¹~~2~~-3.

54. Cf chap. ix, p. 42: "ואל תתיאש מן הפורענות", כיצד? מלמד שיהא לבו של אדם מתפחד בכל יום ויאמר: אוי לי שמא תבא עלי פורענות היום ושמא למחר. ונמצא מתפחד בכל יום, שנאמר כן באיוב "פחד פחדתי ויאתינו (ג' 25)".

55. Cf chap. ii, pp. 12-13: איזהו סיג עשה איוב לדבריו? הרי הוא אומר "איש תם וישר וירא אלקים וסר מרע (א' 8)", מלמד שהרחיק איוב את עצמו מדבר המביא לעבירה ומן הכיעור ומן הדומה לכיעור הרי הוא אומר "ברית כרתי לעיני ומה אתבונן על בתולה? (ל' א 1)", מלמד שהחמיר איוב על עצמו ולא נסתכל אפילו בבתולה. והלא דברים קו'ח? ומה אם בתולה זו שאם ירצה ישאנה לעצמו, לבנו, לאחיו, ולקרובו, החמיר איוב על עצמו ולא נסתכל בה, אשת איש על אחת כמה וכמה? ומפני מה החמיר איוב על עצמו ולא נסתכל אפילו בבתולה? מפני שאמר איוב: שמא אסתכל אני היום ולמחר יבא איש אחר וישאנה ונמצא שאני מסתכל באשת איש.

We may note further that this recension records a notion which is not found either in Version B, or in any other early source, that Job was one of the biblical personalities who was born circumcised

(see below, note 78, for the opposing view that Job was neither circumcised nor a convert).

56. Ed. Schechter, p. 164.

57. מה היה תחילתו של איוב? מלמד שהעיד עליו הקב"ה בעצמו „איש תם וישר ירא אלקים וסר מרע", מלמד שבנה פלטורין על הדרכים ועשה [לן] (להן) ד' פתחים, כל עובר ושב נכנס, אוכל ושותה ומברך לשם שמים

58. We may note in this context, that the names of Job and Abraham appear only in the redacted form of this Baraita. In Soṭah 22b, where - according to Finkelstein - the more original version of this Baraita is preserved, no biblical personalities are mentioned. This strongly suggests that the redactors of this Baraita were responsible, not only for the re-arranging of the order of the Pharisees in the text so as to present the פרוש אהבה as the highest type, but also for the introduction of the biblical prototypes to represent the respective ideals of אהבה and יראה. For further observations on this Baraita, see Levy "Wörterbuch", sub פרוש, p. 142f.

59. Cf BB 15b, the statement of R. Abba b. Shemuel, also the comment of R. Shemuel b. Isaac (and compare GR 39:11, ed. T-A, p. 376, for a similar notion regarding the blessing which resulted from the generous conduct of Abraham); also GR 30:8, ed. T-A,

p. 275, the statement of R. Levi's colleagues.

60. Cf BB 15b; see also R. Johanan's comment in this same source regarding Job and the after-life: מאי "והאתונות רעות על ידיהם (אי' א' 14) "אמר ר' יוחנן, מלמד שהטעימו הקב"ה לאיוב מעין העולם הבא (השחה גם ויק'ר .(4 ,ז' . Apart from this one comment, no further reference is made to Job's share in the after-life in rabbinic sources. On the contrary, R. Hiyya asserted that Job received his deserts in this world, after which God dismissed him, see above, note 41.

It is difficult to ascertain why R. Johanan, contrary to the general tendency in the amoraic period to denigrate Job in favour of Abraham, still maintained a favourable image of this personality. It is noteworthy, however, that R. Johanan expresses views on the subject of martyrdom which accord with the opinions of the earlier Tannaim, among whom Job was held in high esteem (cf San. 74a-b).

61. Cf PR 47, p. 189b-190a. The continuation of this passage is significant for the growing antagonism towards Job in the amoraic period. God is presented as informing Job that he can claim no greatness over Adam, the patriarchs, Moses or Aaron, all of whom withstood the testing of God, while Job had protested against his fate .

62. Cf San. 107a, where in answer to David's question "Why do they not say 'the God of David', just as they say, 'the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob'?", God replies: אינהו מינסו לי ואח לא מינסית לי; cf also GR 94:5, ed. T-A, p. 1177: אין הקב"ה מיהר שמו על בריה בשחוא חי אלא על בעלי "סוריין".

63. Cf Tanh. B. I, p. 166.

64. Tanh. (OV) wa-Yera', 5.

65. Op. cit., p. 270-1.

66. James 5:10-11.

67. Cf Miscel. IV, chap. v, 19 (Stahlin Vol. IV, p. 22f).

68. Cf ibid. VII, chap. xii, 80 (Stahlin Vol. V, p. 84); also II, chap. xx, 103 (Stahlin Vol. III, 225).

69. Cf Tertullian, "Of Patience", chap. 14 (Migne I, 1270-1); Cyprian "On Mortality", 10 (Migne IV, 558); "Of Patience", 18 (Migne ibid., 633-4); Methodius, Catena on Job, chap. xxvi.

70. Both Rabbi and Church Father stress Job's merit in blessing God for evil as well as good (see above, note 31).

71. Cf "Against John of Jerusalem" I, 30 (Migne XXIII, 381-2); also Jerome's prologue to his commentary on Job (Migne *ibid.*, 619).

72. Cf Quaster, "Patrology" III, p. 491.

73. Cf GR 30:10, ed. T-A, p. 276-7; Lekach on Gen. 5:24.

74. Cf BB 16a: כיון דחזיא להקב'ה דנטיה דעתיה בחר
איוב, אמר: חס ושלום מינשי ליה לרחמותיה דאברהם....

The reading דחמותיה is substantiated by manuscript evidence and parallel passages, cf Dikdukei Sopherim *ad loc.*.

75. Cf HUCA VI, 1929, p. 155f.

76. See above, p. 37, note 13 for the relevant sources; also the statement of R. Ishmael that Job was the one God-fearing servant in Pharaoh's retinue (above, p. 38, note 14); similarly R. Akiba's identification of Elihu with Balaam, suggests that he shared this view on Job's dating (cf PT Soṭah v, 20d). Moreover, as Frankl has observed (MGWJ 1872, p. 313), this historical setting for Job coincides with that suggested in Hellenistic sources (*viz.* the Aristeas Fragment, the Colophon to the LXX on Job, and the Testament of Job), where Job as the Edomite king, Jobab, "the fifth from Abraham", is clearly

a contemporary of Amram, Moses' father. However, this correspondence between the scholars of Yabneh and Hellenistic sources, particularly the Testament of Job, on the question of Job's dating, may be more than mere coincidence, as it was among this generation of scholars, that the tradition of Job as a pious martyr-figure, as developed in the Testament, made its reappearance. As to Job's conversion, an important feature of the Testament (see below, p. 103), this is not explicitly mentioned by any of the early Tannaim. Nonetheless it is implied in R. Ishmael's statement above, that Job was God-fearing. Similarly, R. Akiba's statement referring to Job's fulfilment of *מצות ומצוים טובים*, suggests that he regarded Job as a convert, as similar terminology is employed in connection with the conversion of Abraham and Jethro (see below, p. 110, note 19).

77. The opinions of three third generation Tannaim are preserved in our sources. R. Nathan, who regarded Job as an *עובד מאהבה* (above, p. 75 , note 21), assigns him to the days of Solomon. R. Joshua b. Korha on the other hand, assigns Job to the earlier period of the Judges, while R. Eleazar b. Shammu'a suggests the Persian period as Job's historical setting

(cf GR 57:4, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 617. This source also records the view from Seder 'Olam, that Job was a contemporary of the bondage, in the name of a further member of this generation of scholars, R. Jose b. Halaphta, who is traditionally regarded as the authority for this early chronological work). It is possible that this departure from the dating for Job accepted by the earlier authorities, among the generation of scholars following the Bar Kokhba Uprising, may already be due to Christian influence. There is some evidence to show that Job was involved in Jewish-Christian polemics already in the tannaitic period. In ARN Vers. B, ii, p. 12, Job is included in a list of personalities who were regarded as having been born circumcised, Adam, Seth, Noah, Shem, Malchizedek, etc.. This list assumes some special significance in the light of a statement by Jerome (Epistola 73, 2, Migne XXII, 677) who records the view of a number of the Church Fathers on the performance of the sacrificial rite by those who predated circumcision, the priesthood of Aaron, and the Levitical code, namely, Abel, Noah, Enoch, Malchizedek and Job, who was not a Levite, but a descendant of Esau. It is conceivable, therefore, that the teachers cited above, transposed Job from his original pre-Sinaitic setting into the post-Mosaic period of Israel's

history, with the intention of presenting him as a faithful Israelite.

78. Cf GR loc. cit., and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc.. Bar Kappara, reported by Resh Lakish, assigns Job to the days of Abraham. R. Abba b. Kahana, on the other hand, regards him as a contemporary of Jacob, while R. Levi places him in the generation of Jacob's sons. See further, GR 80:4 (ed. T-A, p. 954), which records the early tradition of Job's marriage with Dinah (see below), which is described in this source as a punishment upon Jacob for not giving her to his brother Esau, consequently, she married one who was neither circumcised nor a proselyte! Although the patriarchal period is suggested mainly in amoraic sources as the historical setting for Job, this tradition is very much older. The Testament of Abraham, written presumably in the first century CE (see above, note 49), presupposes that Job was a contemporary of Abraham. This view is reflected further in the opinion expressed by Akiba's contemporary, Ele'azar b. 'Azariah, that Elihu is none other than Isaac (cf PT Soṭah v, 20d). This dating for Job may be presupposed further by the order of personalities cited to illustrate the principle of א"ו in ARN Vers. B, chap. iff, p. 4ff, where Job follows Adam, but precedes Moses (see,

however, Vers. A, *ibid.*, where Job follows Moses). This order is identical with that of the biblical personalities cited by Johanan b. Zaccai's pupils in the first century, in order to comfort him in his mourning for his son (Adam, Job, Aaron, David; cf ARN Vers. A, xiv, p. 58-9). Some significance must also be attached to the confused statement at the opening of the Testament of Job (1:5), where the author describes Job (= Jobab) a descendant of Esau, as being also the brother of Nahor, and the husband of Dinah! This confused genealogy need not be an unintentional error, but an ill-conceived attempt to combine two quite distinct traditions which were current in the author's day (see, however, ed. Brock 1:6, p. 19). We may note in conclusion C.H. Gordon's observation that the Rabbis, in assigning Job to the heroic age of the patriarchs, have correctly located him in the epic period (cf "Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery", "Biblical and other Studies", Cambridge Mass. 1963, p. 7.).

79. Cf GR *op. cit.*; also BB 15a.

80. Cf GR and BB *loc. cit.*. R. Johanan may have based his opinion upon the view of R. Ele'azar b. Shammu'a (above, note 77) that Job lived in the Persian period.

Additional Note I: Convert-Missionary Types

The existence of the Jewish Apostle in early times has long been acknowledged.¹ Even before Christianity made its appearance, preachers of the Jewish faith were active in the Hellenistic world,² whose activities may have been supported by an extensive propaganda-literature aimed at attracting the gentile to the principles and beliefs of Judaism.³ Particularly well-known is the traditional picture of Abraham as the great missionary figure, travelling to and fro in the world, teaching the knowledge of the true God. However, little attention has been given to the type of missionary Abraham was intended to represent, or to the existence of other missionary figures in early sources. The Testament of Job depicts its hero as a missionary who, like Abraham, employed his philanthropy to attract new adherents to the worship of the true God. Similarly, rabbinic tradition records that Jethro undertook the conversion of his fellow countrymen after his departure from the Israelite camp. An interesting feature common to all three of these missionary figures, is that they themselves are depicted as converts. In this study, therefore, we propose to compare a number of traditions regarding Job

recorded in the Testament with similar traditions relating to Abraham and Jethro, in order to show that each one of these personalities emerges in our sources as an idealised type for a special class of early Jewish propagandist, the convert-missionary. Among the early apostles of Judaism it is conceivable that there were converts whose enthusiasm for their newly acquired faith inspired them to spread its teachings among their former associates. In general terms, this is the picture which emerges from the material quoted below. The convert is presented as a distinguished personality, who is moved to discard his old faith and seek knowledge of the truth. His departure from his former mode of worship results in personal danger. Nonetheless, he remains firm in his resolve regardless of the consequences, receiving a new name in keeping with his new personality, and proceeds to spread the knowledge of his faith among men. In its fullest form, this imagery is preserved in the Testament of Job. Although its author has evidently borrowed certain elements from the context of the Abraham legend, one or two important traditions which were subsequently associated with Abraham in rabbinic sources, occur for the first time in the Testament in association with Job.

The Great Nobility of the Convert

There is a marked tendency in rabbinic sources, which has its parallel in Hellenistic literature, to claim converts, whether real or imaginary, from among royal, or otherwise distinguished personalities.⁴ We may presume that this was for propaganda purposes, demonstrating the nobility of the Jewish faith through the character of those whom it attracted. This tendency is probably reflected in the tradition preserved only in non-rabbinic sources, that Job is none other than the Edomite king Jobab.⁵ Similarly, Abraham figures in early traditions as a monarch.⁶ Niclaus of Damascus, quoted by Josephus, describes the patriarch as king of his native city.⁷ The tradition of Abraham's kingship was known also to Philo, although he deals with the subject in spiritualising terms.⁸ The kingship of Jethro is referred to by a further Hellenistic writer, Ezekiel, who describes him not only as priest of Midian, but also as its monarch, ruler and judge.⁹ Some knowledge of this tradition is preserved in Palestinian Jewish sources as can be seen from the comments of Josephus, and the early Tanna, Ele'azar of Modi'in.¹⁰

*Philo 177-178
211, 212, 213
(177, 178, 179)*

*212
Her. 177*

*LXX 177-178
D. 177-178*

To Jan 177-178

The Search for the Truth

The accounts of Abraham's alienation from idolatry, and his subsequent quest for the truth, are of great antiquity, dating back at least to the second century BCE.¹¹ However, from the Testament of Job we see that this tradition was incorporated into the Job-legend already in pre-Christian times. Like Abraham, Job ponders upon the ability of an idol in his vicinity to create all that he surveys, and ultimately resolves to destroy it in the name of the true God.¹² There is some evidence in our sources for a similar tradition relating to Jethro, who, even before the advent of Moses, harboured doubts concerning the idols which he served, and consequently withdrew from his priestly office.¹³

The Convert Suffers for his New Faith

We may regard the Testament of Job as the earliest source for this imagery of the convert suffering for his newly acquired faith. The biblical Book of Job offers no reason for Satan's determined opposition to Job. In the Testament, however, the biblical plot is dramatised considerably. As we noted above, Job intentionally arouses the ire of Satan, who becomes his personal adversary, inflicting

intolerable suffering upon his helpless foe.¹⁴ There is evidence in rabbinic sources for a similar dramatisation of the story of Jethro. No reason is suggested in the biblical account for the apparent hostility of the shepherds to the family of Jethro their priest (Ex. 2:18). According to an unknown Aggadist, however, Jethro's withdrawal from the service of idolatry incurred the displeasure of the Midianites, who completely ostracised their former leader and his family.¹⁵ Abraham's trial in the fiery furnace of Nimrod is well known. This tradition, however, was developed in talmudic times, as no allusion is made in older non-rabbinic sources to Abraham's trial by fire.¹⁶ Although the Book of Judith records an interesting tradition resembling the account of Jethro's excommunication, that the ancestors of the Jewish people were driven forth from their home-land because of their refusal to worship the gods of their fathers.¹⁷

The Convert Receives a New Name

This tradition, taken directly from biblical sources,¹⁸ is well known in connection with Abraham and Jethro. A similarity is observed between the renaming of these two personalities already in tannaitic

sources, their new names, אברהם and יתרו, symbolising their conversion.¹⁹ It is probably in this same context that we should view a tradition entirely unknown in early rabbinic sources, but which may have gained wide currency in the Hellenistic-Jewish world. No foundation or explanation has yet been found for the tradition known to Aristeeas, to the author of the Testament of Job, and to the writer of the Colophon to the Septuagint on Job, that Job originally bore the name of Jobab. Against the background of Job as a convert to the true faith, this change of name can be satisfactorily explained.

Missionary Activity

The missionary activity of both Abraham and Jethro were widely current traditions in talmudic times.²⁰ Abraham in particular is portrayed as the great philanthropist who employs his hospitality to win fresh converts to his faith. It is to be noted, however, that the Abraham-legend is not the earliest context in which this Aggadah is found. The Testament of Abraham, probably written in the first Christian century, commences with a description of Abraham's hospitality, like that found in rabbinic sources, but omits any reference to his proselytising

activities.²¹ Our earliest picture of the philanthropic missionary is preserved in the Testament of Job.²² In view of the antiquity of this source, we can assume that the original prototype for the missionary was Job and not Abraham. However, as a result of the tendency in rabbinic circles to present the patriarch as the supreme example for all saintly virtues and practices, it is Abraham who emerges as the proselytising philanthropist, while the tradition of Job's missionary activity all but disappeared from rabbinic Aggadah.²³

Notes

1. Cf Graetz, "Geschichte der Juden" IV, note 21; Krauss, "Die Jüdischen Apostel", JQR (OS) XVII, p. 370ff; A. von Harnack, "Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums", Leipzig 1902, pp. 237-240.
2. Cf H. Ludin-Jansen, "Existait-il a l'epoque hellenistique des predicateurs itinerents juifs", revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, XVIII, pp. 242-254.
3. Cf U. Rapaport, "Jewish Religious Propaganda and Proselytism in the Period of the Second Commonwealth (in Hebrew) Doctoral Thesis, Hebrew University Jerusalem, 1966.
4. Cf Baraita in Sanhedrin 96b, which enumerates Naaman, Nebuzeradan, the descendants of Sisera, of Senacharib and of Haman, as converts; see also Pirkei Rabbenu ha-Kadhosh (ed. Grünhut) p. 83, for a similar tradition regarding Bithiah, Hiram and Ptolemy. Other royal converts claimed are the ruling family of Adiabene (cf GR 46:10, and Theodor's notes ad loc., p. 467), the empress Valeria (Gerim 2:4; Mechilta Bo 15, ed. Friedmann p. 18a), the emperor Nero (Git. 56a). Although the validity of all the above claims is

questionable, the interest of the upper classes of Roman society need not be doubted (see M. Stern's observations in "Sympathy for Judaism in Roman Senatorial Circles in the Period of the Early Empire", *Zion* XXIX, 1964, pp. 155-167). There is evidence of this same tendency in Hellenistic sources, as can be seen from the Letter of Aristeas, where prominent pagan personalities are cited for their sympathetic attitude towards Jewish Law. As Rapaport observes (*op. cit.*, p. 116ff), such attempts to demonstrate pagan esteem for Jewish traditions held no significance for Jewish readers, but was intended for the gentile as an example to be emulated.

5. See the Testament of Job, the Aristeas Fragment, and the Colophon to the LXX on Job.
6. Cf GR 43:5, ed. T-A, p. 419 for parallels.
7. Cf Antiquities II, vii 2.
8. Cf De Nobilitate, 5.
9. Cf Eusebius, Praep. Evang. ix, 28, ed. Gifford I, p. 549.
10. Cf Antiquities II, xi 2; Mechilta Jethro 1, p. 57b:
ר' אלעזר המודעי אומר: שר היה כענין שנ' "ובני דוד
כהנים היו".

11. Cf Jubilees 11:16ff; Josephus, Antiquities I, vii, 1-2; Philo, De Abrahamo 15; also GR 38:13, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 361f.

12. Cf 1:9ff (ed. Brock, 2:2, p. 20).

13. Cf Ex. R. 1:32, also Tanh. (OV) Shemoth, 11:

והלא הקב"ה שונא עבודת כוכבים, ונתן מנוס למשה אצל
עבודת כוכבים? אלא אמרו רבותינו: יתרו כומר לעבודת
כוכבים היה וראה שאין בה ממש וביסר עליה והרהר לעשות
תשובה עד שלא בא משה, וקרא לבני עירו ואמר להם: עד
עכשיו הייתי משמש אתכם, מעתה זקן אני בחרו לכם כומר אחר.
עמד והוציא כלי תשמישי עכו"ם ונתן להם הכל. עמדו ונידוהו
שלא יודקק לו אדם ולא יעשו לו מלאכה ולא ירעו את צאנו.
ובקש מן הרועים לרעו לו את צאנו ולא קבלו. לפיכך הוציא
בנותיו "ותבאנה ותדלינה", מלמד שהיו מקדימות לבוא מפני
פחד הרועים. "ויבאו הרועים ויגרשום", אפשר הוא כוהן
מדין והרועים מגרשים בנותיו? אלא ללמד שנידוהו וגרשו
בנותיו וגו' (השחה גם רש"י, שמות שם).

(See also Mechilta Jethro, loc. cit., p. 59a; Mechilta
d'R. Shimon b. Yohai, p. 131).

14. See above, p. 43.

15. See above, note 13.

16. Cf GR 38:13, and the numerous parallels cited by
Theodor ad loc., p. 364; see also the late Midrash,
Ma'aseh 'Abraham (Jellineck, Beth-Hammidrasch I,
pp. 25-34), which develops this Aggadah into a martyr
drama resembling the Testament of Job, with Satan

playing a prominent role. On the comparatively late development of this Aggadah in rabbinic circles, see above, p. 82, note 34.

17. Cf 5:5ff.

18. Cf Gen. 17:5, on Abraham's change of name, also 32:29, on Jacob's change of name. It is worthy of note that in rabbinic sources, the term "Athlete" is also used to describe Jacob in his struggle with his supernatural foe, viz. the guardian angel of Esau, cf GR 77:3, ed. T-A, p. 912-3).

19. Cf Mechilta loc. cit., p.57a: מתחילה לא היו קוראין לו אלא יתר, שנ' 'וילך משה אל יתר חותנו' וכשעשה מעשים טובים הוסיפו לו אות אחת. וכן אתה מוצא באברהם שמתחילה לא היו קוראין אותו אלא אברם וכשעשה מעשים טובים הוסיפו לו אות אחת ונקרא אברהם.....

Early aggadic comments on the names of Jethro provide us with two further parallels with the personality of Abraham. As is well-known, "friend of God" is widely employed as the epithet for Abraham in both rabbinic and non-rabbinic literature (see above, p. 87, note 48). In Mechilta loc, cit., Jethro's names חֵבֶר and רְעוּאֵל are taken as an indication that he enjoyed this same especial rank: - "שהיה כרע למקום, 'חבר' - 'רעואל' שיעשה כחבר למקום (see also the statement of R. Shimon b. Menasiah in Sifre Numbers 78, ed. Friedmann, p. 20a).

Similarly the epithet קונה שמים וארץ (Gen. 14:19) is applied midrashically to Abraham in connection with his missionary activity (cf GR 43:7, ed. T-A, p. 421). According to R. Jose (Sifre loc. cit.), Jethro's name Keni also indicates that he had "acquired both heaven and earth" (קיני היה שמו ולמה נקרא קיני? שקנה שמים וארץ; although this reading is not supported by all the parallels cited ad loc., it is substantiated by MSS London and Vatican, Midrash Hakhamim, Yalkut and Yalkut Makiri to Prov. 27:8, see ed. Horovitz ad loc., p. 72).

20. On Abraham, see all the Aramaic versions to Gen. 12:5, also GR 39:14, and the numerous parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 378-9. On Jethro, see Targum Ps. Jonathan to Ex. 18:27; Mechilta Jethro 2, p. 60a; Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yoḥai, p. 134; see further Bacher, "Die Agada der Tannaiten" I, p. 210. See also Loewe's suggestion that the portrayal of Abraham (and possibly Jethro?) as an early Jewish evangelist, may have been a rejoinder to Christian claims of evangelical initiative (cf "Apologetic Motifs in the Targum to the Song of Songs", in "Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations", ed. A. Altmann, Cambridge Mas., 1966, p. 179, note 91).

21. Cf Longer Recension, chap. 1 (Box, p. 1).

22. Cf chap. iii (ed. Brock, chap. 9f, p. 24f) the whole of which is devoted to a description of Job's abundant wealth and his extraordinary generosity, which is unequalled either in length or detail by any existing account of Abraham, see particularly verses 35-6, cited above, p. 87, note 46.

23. Cf ARN ed. Schechter, p. 164, cited above, p. note 57.

Additional Note II: R. Akiba's Attitude towards Job

In conclusion to our studies on Job in general, it is necessary to give some consideration to a specific problem, the contradictory views expressed by R. Akiba regarding Job. Although the relevant material, as with all our early sources, is sparse, it is sufficient to indicate that Akiba, presumably the spiritual leader of the martyr movement of his day, regarded Job favourably. In Sifre Deut. 32, p. 73b (cited above, note 31, p. 78), R. Akiba elevates Job as the example for the desirable reaction to suffering, blessing God for whatever He meted out to him, both good and evil. Further light is shed on Akiba's attitude towards Job by his errant colleague, Elisha b. Abuya, who reports that Akiba interpreted Job 42:12, **וה' ברך את אחריית איוֹב** to infer that God rewarded Job for the meritorious deeds which he possessed in his former years (PT Hag. ii, 77b): **„מראשיתו" - בזכות מצות**. In Mechilta Beshallah 6, p. 33a, we find Akiba apparently defending Job's words in 23:13, **והוא באחר ומי ישיבנו ונפשו אותה ויעש** against Pappos who wished to adhere to the literal, and, therefore, the blasphemous implications of this verse.

However, in complete contrast to these sources, R. Akiba, in his parable of the four princes (cf Semahoth 8; also Midrash Psalms to 26:2, ed. Buber, p. 215f), characterises Job as the son who immediately rebelled against the king when beaten. Although this passage appears anonymously in Midrash Psalms, the manuscript evidence cited by Buber ad loc., adequately supports the reading היה ר' עקיבא'אומר וכו'. We can only assume that this parable represents an earlier attitude of Akiba, before he was inspired by Nahum of Gimzo to regard suffering as a positive virtue (see above, p. 80, note 33), while the other sources cited above, reflect his revised attitude to Job, the prototype martyr, at a time when he had become the champion of the martyr cause.

CHAPTER TWO: ISRAEL AT THE EXODUS AND IN THE WILDERNESS

Having indicated above the relationship between the drama of Job and Israel's early history as a nation,¹ in this chapter we will examine the extent to which the Rabbis have employed the utterances of the principal characters of the Book of Job in their homilies on the exodus and Israel's experiences in the wilderness. Although these themes clearly occupied the most prominent place in the aggadic exegesis of the book as reflected not only in talmudic-midrashic literature, but also in the Targum to Job, our sources have not preserved any explicitly formulated traditions, comparable with those relating to the Generation of the Flood,² naming Job and his associates as "expositors" of the events of the exodus and the wilderness. However, the expressions employed in several sources to introduce proof-texts from Job,³ אִיּוֹב מִפֶּשֶׁן, ⁴ אָמַר אִיּוֹב, ⁵ מִפֶּשֶׁן מִפֶּשֶׁן, suggest the existence of such a tradition. Of particular importance in this context is the isolated notion to be discussed subsequently under its own heading, associating the expression אִיּוֹב in the speeches of Elihu with the giving of the Law.⁶ Once again our sources may have preserved only a remnant of more extensive traditions which assigned

certain themes to the speeches of each character. For it will be shown in the following pages that the selection of verses from Job was by no means random. Certain speeches of four of the characters in the book were evidently regarded as a commentary, either of a contemporary or prophetic nature, of events and incidents in Israel's early history. Moreover, in one or two cases, a chapter has evidently been associated with a specific theme.

I. The Speeches of Job

Although we will endeavour to show that several of Job's speeches may have been associated in rabbinic thought with themes relating to the exodus and the wilderness, one chapter in particular is of special significance as it illustrates our observation above regarding the interpretation of several passages with reference to specific themes. Already in tannaitic times the interpretation of chapter 28 in connection with the personality of Moses, was quite extensive. Two Tannaim found an allusion in verses 12-14, and 21-23, to an incident relating to Moses' death. Moses' efforts to avoid death is a theme which occurs widely in our sources, and to which we shall have occasion to refer again subsequently.⁷ His final acceptance of his fate was not without reservations.

Although he was doomed to die, he requested God that his soul might escape the clutches of the Angel of Death. In the following passage, two slightly differing descriptions are given of the angel's

vain quest for Moses' soul:⁸ אמר משה לפני הקב"ה: רבוץ העולמים, הואיל וגזרת עלי מיתה אל תמסרני ביד מלאך המות. א"ל הקב"ה: היך שאני מיטפל בך וגונזך. והראהו הקב"ה מושבו כשם שהראה לאהרן אחיו, וכשראה כסאו בתוך גן עדן נתקוררה דעתו עליו. באותה שעה אמר הקב"ה למלאך המות: לך והביא נשמתו של משה. הלך וחיזר בכל העולם ולא מצאו, הלך אצל הים א"ל: ראית משה? א"ל מיום שהעלה את ישראל מתוכי שוב לא ראיתיו. הלך אצל הרים וגבעות אמר להם: ראיתם משה? א"ל: מיום שקיבל תורה מהר סיני שוב לא ראינו אותו, אי שמא הוא עומד ומתחנן לפני הקב"ה שיכנס לארץ ישראל. הלך לו לארץ ישראל אמר לה: שמא נפשו שלמשה כאן? אמרה לו: "ולא תמצא בארץ החיים". הלך לו אצל ענני כבוד אמר (לו) להם: שמא נפשו שלמשה כאן? אמרו לו: "ונעלמה מעיני כל חי". הלך לו אצל מלאכי השרת אמר להן: שמא נפשו של משה כאן? אמרו "ומעוף השמים נסתרה" – אלו מלאכי השרת שנקראו מעופפין.⁹ הלך לו אצל התהום א"ל: שמא נפשו שלמשה כאן? א"ל: לאו שנ' "תהום אמר לאבי הוא". הלך לו אצל שאול ואבדון ואמר: ראיתם משה? אמרו לו: שמעו שמענו אותו לא ראינו שנ' אבדון ומות אמרו באזנתו שמענו שמעה". אבא היה דורש משום ר' ישמעאל ביר' יוסי¹⁰ "אבדון ומות אמרו באזנינו שמענו" מלאכי השרת כתיב כתיב עומדין ומקלסין מסתו שלמשה ואומ' "יבוא שלום ינוחו על משכבותם (ישע' נ' 2)". הלך אצל מלאכי השרת אמר להן: ראיתם משה? אמרו לו: לך אצל בני אדם. הלך אצל בני אדם אמר להן: ראיתם משה? אמרו לו "אלקים הבין דרכה והוא ידע את מקומה", הוא גנזו לחי העולם הבא ואין כל בריה יודעת בו, שנ' "והחכמה מאין תמצא", וגו'".¹¹

Two further verses from this chapter have been interpreted with reference to Moses, reflecting a notion which occurs in varying forms in our sources, particularly in connection with Job 37:5, God's miraculous manipulation of His voice.¹² In a lengthy homily recorded in both editions of the Tanhuma¹³, Job 28:25-6, have been employed in a description of God's special means of communication with Moses. Although, when addressing the prophet in the tent of assembly, God spoke in the thunderous voice of Sinai, which was so channelled, that Moses alone could hear it:

ומניין שבקול מתן תורה היה מדבר? שכן הוא אומר „קול ה' בכח קול ה' בהדר קול ה' שובר ארזים (תה' כ'ט, 4-5)“,¹⁴ וכן הוא אומר „ובבא משה אל אהל מועד לדבר אתו וישמע את הקול מדבר אליו (במד' ז, 89)“ - קול שהיה שומע במתן תורה. וכן היה מדבר על כל דבור ודבור, ועל כל אמירה ואמירה, שמא תאמר ישראל היו שומעים את הקול מבחוץ, תלמוד לומר „וישמע את הקול“ - הוא היה שומע את הקול בלבד. וכי מאחר שבקול גבוה היה מדבר למה לא היו שומעים? לפי שגזר הקב"ה על הדבור שיצא וילך אצל משה ועשה לו הקב"ה שביל שבו יצא הדבור עד שיגיע למשה, ולא נשמע לכאן ולכאן שנ' „לעשות לרוח משקל“ - שכל דבור שיוצא מפי הקב"ה הכל במשקל, וכן הוא אומר „ודרך לחזיון קולות“ שעשה לו הקב"ה דרך לאותו הקול שיוצא אצל משה בלבד, שנ' „ויקרא אל משה וידבר ה' אליו“ - אליו היה נשמע ולא לאחר.

Although a full discussion of Job 37:5, referred to above, is out of place in this context, and must be included in our observations on the

speeches of Elihu, it is to be noted that the notion expressed in the above passage, has its origins in a tannaitic statement on the basis of this verse. Moreover, the teacher with whom this notion is associated, suggests that it may have some mystical or speculative connotations. Ben 'Azzai, referring to Num. 7:89, quoted above, describes God's special means of communication with Moses in terms of a pipe or tube reaching into the ear of Moses, thereby excluding even the Ministering Angels from His discourse with the prophet:¹⁵ "וידבר אליו" - ולא למלאכי השרת שהיו שם, מגיד הכתוב שהיה יוצא הקול מפי הקב"ה כמין סילון לתוך אזנו של משה והמלאכים היו באמצע ולא היו שומעין אותו, ובן הוא אומר "ירעם קל בקולו נפלאות", הרי - 'And He spoke unto him (Num. 7:89)' - "וידבר אליו".

exclusively, and not to the Ministering Angels who were present! The Scriptures indicate that the Voice issued forth from the mouth of God in the form of a pipe into the ear of Moses, so that the angels standing in between could not hear it, thus it is said, 'God showed them wonders with His voice (Job 37:5)'. Hence it is written, 'And He spoke unto him'.¹⁶

It is interesting to note that this same theme of God's discourse with Moses, associated in an earlier passage with 28:25-6, is reflected also in the interpretation of verses 27-8 of this chapter. From our sources we see that these two verses were

linked in rabbinic thought with several notions relating to the revelation of the Torah. This is illustrated by the following passage dealing with God's preparations at the time of the revelation. Before addressing Himself to Moses, God set the example for the mortal teacher by first preparing His discourse. However, R. Aha and his colleagues differed on the number of preparations implied in verse 27: ¹⁷ "אז ראה ויספרה": ¹⁸ רבנן ורבי אחא. רבנן אמרי: ¹⁹ כל דיבור ודיבור שהיה הקב"ה אומר למשה היה אומרו שתי פעמים בלבד ואח"כ היה אומר למשה, ומ'ט? "אז ראה ויספרה" חד, "הכינה וגם הקרה" חד, ואח"כ "ויאמר לאדם" זה משה.²⁰ ורבי אחא אמר: ארבע, "אז ראה" חד, "ויספרה" חד, "הכינה" חד, "וגם הקרה" חד, ואח"כ "ויאמר לאדם" זה משה.²⁰

A further speech of Job which may have been associated specifically with notions and traditions relating to the exodus and the wilderness is contained in chapter 12.²¹ The general theme of the latter part of this chapter, God's ability to dispense with kings, princes and priests as He chooses, evidently suggested some association with the fate of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, as can be seen from expositions of several verses from this chapter, particularly verses 23-4:'משגיא לגוים ויאבדם וגו'. ... 'מסיר לב ראשי עם הארץ וגו'. In the following statement, these two verses are adduced in answer to the question regarding the necessity of the ten

22

plagues, when the first alone would have sufficed: וכי
לא היה הקב"ה להציל ישראל מיד מצרים במכה ראשונה? אלא
לקיים מה שנאמר "משגיא לגוים ויאבדם....", וכתיב "מסיר
.".... ("But was God not able to
deliver Israel from the power of the Egyptians
through the first plague? However, the ten plagues
were intended to fulfil that which is said (Job 28:23),
'He acts mightily towards the nations and so destroys
them!', and it is written, 'He taketh away the hearts
of the chiefs of the people of the land (ibid., 24)'.".

The interpretation of these two verses above
presents some difficulty. Our rendering presupposes
that משגיא was taken as an internal hiph'il, "He acts
mightily", viz. through the plagues, in order to
impress His power upon the Egyptians, a notion borne
out by a further statement in the same context as the
above passage. It is more difficult to determine from
this brief statement, the precise interpretation which
was placed upon verse 24, or how it was related to
the theme of God's underlying motives in bringing
the plagues upon the Egyptians. It is possible that
this passage presupposes an Aggadah preserved in a
fragmentary Midrash from the Genizah. The Amora
R. Isaac found in Job 12:24, an allusion to the
hardening of Pharaoh's heart. However, Pharaoh's
confirmed obstinacy was not without a purpose. His

23

initial hard-heartedness was of his own doing, then God made his retreat impossible in order to display His wondrous power among the Egyptians: א'ר יצחק: כתיב, "מסיר לב ראשי עם חארץ ויתעם בתהו לא דרך", אתה מוצא מאחר ששלה הקב"ה את משה אצל פרעה והקשה את לבו, שאינך מוצא בה' מכות הראשונות "ויחזק ה' את לב פרעה (שם ט 12)", והכביד את לבו שנ' "ויכבד פרעה את לבו (שם ח 28)" "ויפן ויצא (פרעה) ויבא אל ביתו ולא שת לבו גם לזאת (שם ז' 23)", א'ל הקב"ה: מתחלה אתה היית מכבד לבך מיכן ואילך אני מוסיף על לבך, שנ' "כי אני הכבדתי את לבו (שם י' 1)" וגם הוא אומר למשה "ואני ידעתי כי לא יתן אתכם מלך מצרים להלך (שם ב' 19)", לכך הוא אומר "ואני אקשה את לב פרעה והרביתי את אותותי ואת מופתי בארץ מצרים (שם ז' 3)", הוי כלפועל ה' למענהו (וגם רשע ליום רעה (משלי ט' ז' 4).²⁴

It is to be noted that the application of these verses to the theme of the Egyptians' downfall, can be traced back to tannaitic sources, where they occur in connection with an Aggadah which gained wide currency in talmudic times. The punishment wrought by God upon the deities of Egypt as well as its population is the subject of a number of legends.²⁵ However, we find already in tannaitic sources, a notion exclusively associated with 12:23-4, that one idol, Baal Zaphon, was spared by God for a special purpose. According to an early Aggadah, when Pharaoh beheld the Israelites apparently helpless upon the shores of the Red Sea, before the sanctuary of Baal Zaphon, he took it as an omen that this idol, which

had survived the fate of the other deities, was supporting his original intention to destroy Israel by water, and began to pay homage to this god.²⁶ In the following passage, however, it is revealed that the survival of Baal Zaphon was merely a ruse to lure the Egyptians to their fate:²⁷ ובעל צפון נשת״ר מכל הי״ראות בשביל לפתוח לבן של מצרים, עליהם הוא אומר ״משגיא לגוים ויאבדם...״ (מסיר לב ראשי עם הארץ ויתעם בתהו לא דרך).²⁸

A further notion relating to the exodus which has been associated with chapter 12, concerns the role of the elders at the time of the redemption. The following passage is only one of the numerous panegyrics to be found in our sources praising the nobility and godliness of these early leaders.²⁹ In all probability these passages are coloured by a strong feeling on the part of the Rabbis that they were the latter-day זקנים, the counterpart of the men who played an important role in the welfare and affairs of Israel from the time of its inception as a nation. According to an unknown Aggadist, Job 12:12, בישישים

is a record of the praise to be accorded to the elders because they were instrumental³⁰ in securing Israel's faith in God: ״ויקרא משה לכל זקני ישראל (ויאמר אליהם משכו וקחו לכם צאן למשפחותיכם ושחטו הפסח: שמות י׳ב, 21): ״הה׳ ד״ב ישישים חכמה ואורך ימים תבונה״, למה זכו הזקנים שיגאלו ישראל על ידיהן? אלא בשעה שנגלה הקב״ה אל (על) משה בסנה, א״ל ״לך ואספת את זקני ישראל (שם ג׳ 16)״, כיון שבא משה מיד ״וילך משה ואהרן

וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵל כָּל זָקֵנֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (שם, ד' 29), וַאֲמַר "וַיֹּאמְרוּ
הָעָם (שם, 31)". אָמַר הַקֶּבֶה: הָרִינִי פֹרַע לִזְקֵנִים עַל שַׁעֲשׂוֹ
אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל לְהִאֲמִין בְּשִׁמִּי בַשָּׁעָה שֶׁאָמַר מֹשֶׁה (וַאֲמַר לָהֶם) "אֵלֵקִי
אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם שִׁלַּחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם", אֵילֹו לֹא קִבְּלוּ הַזְקֵנִים אֶת דְּבָרָיו שֶׁל
מֹשֶׁה, אָף כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא הָיוּ מִקְבָּלִים, אֲלֹא הַזְקֵנִים קִבְּלוּ תַחִילָה
וּמִשְׁכּוֹ כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל אַחֲרֵיהֶם, וַעֲשׂוּ אוֹתָן לְהִאֲמִין לְשֵׁמוֹ שֶׁל הַקָּדוֹשׁ
בְּרוּךְ הוּא. אָמַר הַקָּדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא: אָף אֲנִי עוֹשֶׂה לָהֶם כְּבוֹד,
[וְתִהְיֶה] (וְיִהְיֶה) גְּאוּלַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל יְדִיהֶן שִׁיְהִיו יִשְׂרָאֵל שׁוֹחֲטִים
פִּסְחֵיהֶם עַל יְדִיהֶן שֶׁל זָקֵנִים, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר "וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה לְכָל זָקֵנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל וּגְוֹ", לְפִיכֶךְ הַכְּתוּב מִשְׁבַּחַן "בִּישִׁישִׁים חֲכָמָה".³¹

The remaining passage to be considered with reference to chapter 12, although unconnected with any of the themes already discussed, is further evidence of some association between this chapter and events from early Israelite history. The legend of the gentiles' refusal to accept the Torah before it was offered to Israel, is well-known, and occurs widely in our sources.³² According to a tradition found in older sources only in Genesis Rabbah 53:9 (ed. T-A, 564f), those gentiles who had been granted dominion through suckling at the breasts of the matriarch Sarah, were deprived of this distinction through their

alienation from God at Sinai:³³ רַבֵּן וְרַבִּי אַחָא, רַבֵּן
אֲמַרִי: כָּל מִי שֶׁבָּא לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם נַעֲשֶׂה יָרָא שָׁמַיִם. רַבִּי אַחָא אָמַר:
אָף מִי שֶׁלֹּא בָּא לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם נִיתָן לוֹ מִמְּשָׁלָה בַּעֲוֹה'וֹ, כִּיּוֹן
שֶׁהִפְלִיגוּ עֲצָמָן בְּסִינִי וְלֹא קִבְּלוּ אֶת הַתּוֹרָה, נִיטְלָה מֵהֶם אוֹתָהּ
הַמִּמְשָׁלָה שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר "מוֹסֵר מַלְכִּים פֶּתַח... (אִיּוֹב י' 18)".³⁴

One further speech of Job which may have been

associated with notions relating to the exodus and the wilderness is contained in chapter 9. However, the evidence in our sources is not as extensive as that for the two chapters already discussed.³⁵

Nonetheless, one or two interesting ideas, which may have their origins in early times, have been associated with verses from this chapter. We referred above to the well-known legend of the gentiles rejecting the Law before God offered it to Israel. However, in a passage based on 9:10, preserved in the fragmentary Midrash cited earlier,³⁶ a very different picture is given of the gentile reaction to the exodus. According to an unknown Aggadist, the nations of the world, on witnessing the miracle of the exodus, assembled in their legions to adjoin themselves to the faith of the true God: וישמע יתרו (.... את כל אשר עשה אלקים וגו': שמ' י' ח 1): "וש'ה עושה גדולות עד אין חקר וגו'",³⁷ כשיצאו ישראל ממצרים, אמרו אומות העולם: אין לך אומה בעולם כאילו; והיו מתקבצין כל הלגיונות ובאין ומתגבירין ונכנסין תחת כנפי השכינה. ד'א, "וישמע יתרו", מה שמועה שמע ובא? שמע שנקרע הים לפני בני ישראל והמים עמדו להם מימימנם ומשמאלם ובא ונתגבר. א'ר שמעון: שמע כי המן יורד מן השמים והשליו וכל תאותם, ובא ונתגבר (השחה תה' ע'ח, 24, וגם במד' י'א, 4).³⁸ א'ר יוסי: שמע כי ענני כבוד עליהם מגינה מחוס היום ומקרח הלילה, ובא ונתגבר. א'ר יהודה: לא הניח יתרו כל עבודה זרה שבעולם אלא עד שעבדם, וכשראה כי אין בהם ממש, הניחם ובא ונתגבר, לכך נאמר "עושה גדולות עד אין חקר ונפלאות עד אין מספר".

The second of the two Aggadoth in this passage is well-known, and is clearly based on older sources.³⁹ However the notion expressed in the first homily, that the exodus produced a wave of conversion in the gentile world, does not occur elsewhere in rabbinic literature. There are one or two allusions in older sources which suggest that the miracle of Israel's deliverance attracted converts from among the Egyptians. In Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yoḥai to Exodus 12:38, the "mixed multitude" is defined as slaves and converts.⁴⁰ Philo, no doubt drawing on the same tradition, characterises those who accompanied Israel out of Egypt as the offspring of Egyptian-Hebrew unions, and those who loved the God of Israel and, therefore, followed His people.⁴¹ These sources, however, hardly compare with the graphic description recorded in the above passage of a world-wide movement to join the ranks of the true believers. It is conceivable that this passage reflects the older concept of Israel as a proselytising or missionary people, who are presented as attracting vast numbers from the gentile world, already at the time of their inception as a nation. Although this notion cannot be supported by any further evidence from our sources, we may note the suggestion that the exodus itself was used for propaganda purposes in pre-rabbinic times.⁴²

Pl. 20-40 BCE

2nd CE

or the other way round 27

A further Aggadic theme occurring in early sources, which is reflected in the interpretation of several verses from the Book of Job, is the audaciousness of Moses' speech towards God. In a number of passages occurring widely in our sources, Moses is portrayed as speaking to God in the boldest and most forthright terms.⁴³ Already in tannaitic times, R. Akiba depicts God as having to protect His prophet from the Divine Attribute of Justice which sought to slay Moses for his overbearing words.⁴⁴ In the following passage, Job's own daring assertions in 9:22, הם

ורשע הוא מכלה, for which he is sharply criticised in our sources,⁴⁵ are put into the mouth of Moses. In his desperate attempts to avoid the inevitability of his death, to which we referred earlier,⁴⁶ Moses challenges the justice of God in treating him, a faithful servant, in the same manner as the ten spies!⁴⁷ הכל

כאשר לכל מקרה אחד לצדיק ולרשע (קהלת ט' 2): אמר משה לפני הקב"ה: רבון העולמים, הכל שחין לפניך, הם ורשע הוא מכלה". מרגלים הכעיסו לפניך בדיבת הארץ, ואני ששימשתי את בניך במדבר ארבעים שנה, מקרה אחד לי ולהם? משל למה הדבר דומה? למלך שביקש לישא אשה, שלח שלוחין לראותה אם נאה היא ואם לאו. הלכו וראו אותה, באו ואמרו לו: ראינו אותה ואין עזובה וכעורה ממנה. שמע שושבינה ואמר: מרי אין נאה הימנה בעולם. בא לישא אותה, אמר אבי הנערה לשלוחי המלך: נשבע אני שאין אחד מכם נכנס, כיון שבזיתם אותה לפני המלך. בא השושבין ליכנס, ואמר ליה: אף אתה לא תכנס. א'ל השושבין: אני לא ראיתיך ואמרתי למלך שאין נאה הימנה, ואותם אמרו אין כעורה הימנה, ועכשיו אראה אם כדברי אם

כדבריהם. כך אמר משה לפני הקב"ה: רבוננו של עולם, המרגלים
דברו לשון הרע, "ארץ אוכלת יושביה (במד' י' ג' 32)", אבל
אני לא ראיתי אותה ושיבחתה לפני בניך ואמרתי "כי ה'
אלקיך מביאך אל ארץ טובה וגו' (דבר' ח' ז')", ועכשיו
אראה אותה אם כדברי אם כדבריהם, שנ' "אעברה נא ואראה את
הארץ הטובה (שם ג' 25)", א'ל "כי לא תעבור (שם, 27)",
אמר ליה: אם כן, הכל שוין לפניך, "תם ורשע הוא
מכלה".

In this passage, Moses is presented as
pleading his own cause before God. More frequent in
our sources are the descriptions of Moses' bold pleas
on behalf of Israel.⁴⁸ One of these has again been
associated with a verse from a speech of Job, 17:19,

ויאחז צדיק דרכו. As in the above passage, Job's
words are attributed to Moses who, in his efforts to
assuage God's anger, commands Him,⁴⁹ as it were, to
remember His 'trade-mark', the characteristic virtue
by which He is known to His creatures:⁵⁰ "ויאחז צדיק
דרכו": בשעה שהכעיסו המרגלים הקב"ה, אמר משה: רבש"ע תפוס
דרכך, תפוס אומנותך, שכל הצדיקים תפשו אומנותם, אברהם
תפש את המילה, יצחק את התפלה, יעקב את האמת, "תתן אמת
ליעקב", יוסף את החסידות, "ויט אליו חסד", משה את הענוה,⁵¹
והאיש משה ענו, אהרן את השלום, "בריתי היתה אתו החיים
והשלום", פנחס את הקנאה, "בקנאו את קנאתי", אף אתה תפוס
אומנותך. ומהו אומנותי? אמר לו "קל רחום וחנון", הדא
הוא דכתיב "ועתה יגדל נא כח ה' (כאשר דברת לאמר,
ה' ארך אפים ורב חסד נושא עון ופושע)".

("Let the Righteous One hold fast to His way (Job
17:9): When the spies provoked God, Moses said,

'Lord of the Universe, hold fast to Your way! Hold fast to your characteristic virtue! Because all the righteous ones have held fast to their characteristic virtues! Abraham held fast to the covenant of circumcision, Isaac to prayer, Jacob to truth, as it is said "You bestow truth upon Jacob (Micah 7:20)", Joseph to piety, as it is said "And He inclined unto him on account of his piety (Gen. 39:21)", Moses to humility as it is said "And the man Moses was exceedingly humble (Num. 12:3)", Aaron to peace, as it is said "My covenant was with him of life and peace (Mal. 2:5)", Phineas to zealousness as it is said "in that he was zealous with My zealousness (Num. 25:2)". Therefore, You also, hold fast to Your characteristic virtue!' 'And what is My characteristic virtue?' God asked, Moses replied, 'A merciful and gracious God!', hence it is said, 'And now, let the power of the Lord be great as You have spoken saying: The Lord is slow to anger and plenteous in loving-kindness, forgiving iniquity and transgression (Num. 14:17-18)'.")'.

While it is beyond the scope of this chapter to consider in detail all the material relating to this theme, it is necessary to offer some explanation for this curious motif in rabbinic

sources. Against the general tendency of toning down offensive, or questionable statements in the Scriptures, the Rabbis have clearly amplified and exaggerated Moses' forthright utterances. It is possible that this unusual tendency reflects an early notion which occurs in a well-developed form already in the writings of Philo.⁵² Philo comments at length upon the audacities of Moses' bold discourses,⁵³ but observes that this is the prerogative of the friends of God, like Moses and Abraham,⁵⁴ who, on account of their unquestionable motives, may adopt a boldness of expression and a frankness of speech, as is customary between friends. It is highly probable that this notion did not originate with Philo, but has its roots in Palestinian Aggadah, where, interestingly enough, the forthright utterances of Moses to God are actually compared to the intimate friend of a king who may address himself to his sovereign in bold and even arrogant terms, so long as his remarks are heard by none but the king:⁵⁵

„יען לא האמנתם בי להקדישני לעיני⁵⁵ בני ישראל לא תביאו את הקהל הזה אל הארץ אשר נתתי להם", וכי לא אמר משה דבר קשה מזה? שנאמר „הצאן ובקר ישחט להם (במד' י"א 22)". אף שם אינה אמנה והיא גדולה מזו, ולמה לא גזר עליו הקב"ה מיתה שם? משל למלך שהיה לו אוהב והיה מגיס בינו לבין המלך בדברים קשים, ולא הקפיד עליו המלך, לימים עמד והגיס בפני הלגיונות, גזר עליו מיתה. אף כך אמר הקב"ה למשה מה שעשית ביני לבינך לא הקפדת, עכשיו כנגד הרבים אי אפשר, שנ' „להקדישני לעיני בני ישראל (שם כ' 12)".

The Speeches of Eliphaz

Although the material to be quoted under this heading is not as extensive as that relating to the speeches of Job, nonetheless, it is of special interest and importance. While the allegorical interpretation of Eliphaz' utterances is limited almost entirely to his two speeches in chapters 5 and 15, it illustrates well our statement above, that certain sections of the Book of Job were evidently regarded as a commentary, either of a contemporary or prophetic nature, on events relating to the exodus and the wilderness. A considerable portion of chapter 5 has been interpreted with reference to a whole range of subjects, commencing with the exodus and the downfall of the Egyptians, the war with the Amalekites, the giving of the Law, Balaam and the Midianites, Og and Sihon, the Canaanites - a veritable résumé of all the events in Israel's early history up to the time of their arrival in the Holy Land. The source for this lengthy exposition is an unusual one, the Targum to Job. As we have observed below,⁵⁶ this Targum, at least in its present form, is not particularly rich in its aggadic content, consequently the numerous aggadic allusions to the above-mentioned themes which have been incorporated into its rendering

of chapter 5, are all the more remarkable. It is of further interest to note how the Targumist has portrayed Eliphaz as speaking of the events immediately surrounding the redemption in the past tense, while the hazards of the wilderness, Balaam, Og, Sihon, etc., are referred to as future events. It is possible that the translator has merely followed the tenses of the verbs in the Masoretic Text. On the other hand, it is conceivable that he was influenced by the notion already discussed above, that Job's trial and his discussions with his friends actually took place while Israel was proceeding across the Red Sea towards Sinai. The Targumist, therefore, has taken the verses of the latter part of the chapter as a prophetic utterance on the part of Eliphaz:-

12) He set at nought the plans	דבטל מחשבתהון
of the Egyptians which they	דמצראי דחכימו
cleverly devised to do evil	לאבאשא לישראל
to Israel, but their hands	ולא עבדא
did not perform the counsel	אידיהון מלכת
of their wisdom.	חכמתהון.

13) He ensnares the wise men	מאחד חכימי
of Pharaoh in their wisdom,	פרעה בחכימותהון
and the counsel of his	57 ומלכת אסטגיננה
trickster-astrologers, He	עוקמניא אוחית
brings down upon them. ⁵⁸	עליהון.

14) They meet with darkness in בימם יכרעון
the day-time, and grope at noon- חשוך, והיך
day as in the night.⁵⁹ ליליא ימשמשון בטיהרא.

15) And He delivered His people ופרק עמיה מן
from the slaughtering of their קטילא דפומהון,
mouth, and from the hand of a ומן יד מלך
powerful king, He delivered a תקיף עמא
poor people חשיכא.

19) He will deliver you in six בשית עקתיך
troubles, even in the seventh יפצונך, ובשביעתא
He will not allow evil near to לא יקריב בך
you. ביש.

20) In the famine of Egypt He בכפן דמצרים
delivered you from death,⁶⁰ and פרקך ממותא,
from the slaughter of the ובקרבא דעמלק
sword in the war with Amalek. מקטול סיפא.

21) From the damaging tongue of בנזקא דלישן
Balaam you will hide between דבלעם חטמר
the clouds of glory,⁶¹ and you ביני עוניא,
shall not fear the injury of ולא תדחל מן
the Midianites when it comes. חבל מדינאי כד יתי.

22) You will laugh at the לחבל סיחן
destruction of Sihon and the ולאולצן מדבורא
famine of the wilderness, nor תגחך, ומן משרית
shall you be afraid of the עוג דמתיל לחיות

soldiers of Og, who is likened to a wild beast of the earth.⁶² ברא דארעא לא תדחל.

23) For your covenant will be with the tablets of stone which were given with great publicity in open country;⁶³ moreover, the Canaanites, who are compared to wild beasts, have made peace with you. ארום עם לוחי אבנא דאמיהבו בפומבי בחקלא קימר, וכנענאי דמתיילין להיות ברא, אשלימו עמר.

The above rendering of the Targum is unusual in one further respect. In the entire corpus of talmudic-midrashic literature, we find no parallels either for the passage as a whole, or for the renderings of the individual verses. It is feasible, however, that the Targumist had before him a single source, rather than a number of Midrashim, upon which he based his exegesis.⁶⁴ A passage of this type, containing an exposition of a whole series of consecutive verses from Eliphaz' speech in chapter 15, has been preserved in our sources, relating to a particular theme, the personality of Korah:⁶⁵ אמר איוב: "וישכן ערים נכחדות בתים לא ישבו למו אשר התעתדו לגלים לא יעמד ולא יקום חילו ולא יטה לארץ מנלם. לא יסור מני חשך יונקתו תיבש שלהבת ויסור ברוח פיו. אל יאמן בשוא נתעה כי שוא תהיה תמורתו. בלא יומו תמלא וכפתו לא רעננה. יחמס כגפן בסרו וישלך כזית נצתו. כי עדת חנף גלמוד ואש אכלה אהלי שחד". "וישכן ערים נכחדות בתים לא ישבו למו

⁶⁶
 אשר התעמדו לגלים", זה היה קרח שהיה קתליקוס לביתו של
 פרעה, והיו בידו מפתחות האוצרות שלו. א'ל הקב'ה: מה הנאה
 יש לך? איך אתה שולט עליהם, שנ' "בתים לא ישבו למו אשר
 התעמדו לגלים" - למי הן מעותדין? לאלו שהן גולין, ישראל
 שגלו ממצרים, אבל קרח "לא יעשר ולא יקום חילו" - אף
 כשימות אינו קם "ולא יטה לארץ מנלם". "לא יסור מני חשך
 לעולם", אינו סר מן החשך, "יונקתו⁶⁷ תיבש שלהבת", אמרו
 רבותינו: אשתו של קרח כשירדה לגיהנם כיבת אותה. "ויסור
 ברוח פיו", שלא יאמר: שמואל עתיד לעמוד ממני ובשבילו
 אני נמלט.⁶⁹ "אף הוא יסור ברוח פיו. אל יאמן בשוא נתעה",⁷⁰
 הקב'ה צחה אל (על) ר'ן איש שחלקו עמו: אל תאמינו טועה
 הוא "אל יאמן בשוא נתעה כי שוא תהיה תמורתו בלא יומו
 תמלא", עד שלא יגיע קצו למות הוא ממית עצמו. "יחמס כגפן
 בסרו" - זו אשתו, "וישלך כזית נצתו" - אלו בניו,⁷² ולמה?
 "כי עדת הנף גלמוד ואש אכלה אהלי שחד", "ואש יצאה מאת
 ה'".⁷³

In the light of these two lengthy
 expositions, we may presume that the speeches of
 Eliphaz did occupy some special place in rabbinic
 thought relating to the events at the exodus and in
 the wilderness. This is reflected further in one or
 two expositions of verses from Eliphaz' speech in
 chapter 4. Once again, several proof-texts from this
 chapter have been applied notably to a single theme,
 the giving of the Law, without any indication of their
 appropriateness to this subject. This suggests that an
 association between chapter 4 and the events at Sinai
 was acknowledged in early times. Our first passage,
 which occurs anonymously in a tannaitic source,

expresses a curious notion based on verses 15-16, which does not occur elsewhere in rabbinic Aggadah. As a result of the experience of the revelation at Sinai, the hair of the Israelites stood on end: "יזבחו לשדיים: לא יזבחו אלהים לא ידעום חדשים מקרוב באו לא שערום אבותיכם (דבר' ל'ב 17)", [שלא עמדה שערת אבותיכם בפניהם] כדרך שעמדה על הר סיני, שנ' "ורוח על פני יחלוף [תסמר שערת בשרי]. יעמד ולא אכיר מראהו לנגד עיני דממה וקול אשמע".⁷⁴

In our second source, which contains a homily on the relationship between the Decalogue and the ensuing legal code (Exodus 21ff), Job 4:21 is introduced to support the notion that the legal precepts contained in Sedher Mishpatim were instituted to ensure the obedience to the injunctions embodied in the Decalogue:⁷⁵ "ואלה המשפטים: "ויהי ביום השלישי בהיות הבקר", בבקר ניתנה התורה ובערב נתנו המשפטים, הה' דמבקר לערב יוכתו מבלי משים לנצח יאבדו". משל לב' שירדו למוקמא, אחד אומן ואחד הדיוט, מי גרם להדיוט ללקות? לפי שלא היה לו מי שילמדנו. כך הקדוש ברוך עמד על הר סיני And these are the judgements which you shall put before them (Ex. 21:1)': It is written, 'And it came to pass on the third day, when it was morning (ibid., 19:16)', thus, in the morning the Law (viz. the principles of the Law) was given,⁷⁶ while in the evening the 'Judgements' (viz. the details relating to the implementation of the Law, punishments etc.) were given, as it is said, 'They

will be punished through the instruction given in the evening, for their infringement of the Law given in the morning! for without judgements (viz. a knowledge of the workings of justice), they would perish continually through the breaking of the Law (Job 4:20)⁷⁷. It may be compared to two who entered the arena for combat⁷⁸, the one a professional, the other an amateur. What was the cause for the amateur being beaten? Because he had no one to train him! Thus God stood upon Sinai, dealing with the dispensation of justice, as it is said, 'My hand laid on justice (Deut. 32:41).'⁷⁹

We may note in conclusion that the above two homilies, like the lengthier expositions quoted earlier, are once again without parallel in the entire corpus of talmudic-midrashic literature. We have, therefore, a collection of isolated expositions, relating to three of Eliphaz' speeches, all referring to the same series of events. Is it possible that they were all derived from the one aggadic source? In the absence of more concrete evidence, we can only conjecture that the above-quoted passages are excerpts, or the fragmentary remains of a more comprehensive midrashic commentary on Eliphaz' utterances, which was current in early times.

III. The Speeches of Elihu

The evidence for some association between Elihu and the events of the exodus and the wilderness, is more explicit than for any other character in the Book of Job. For this enigmatic personality, who is the subject of several strange and unparalleled traditions in both rabbinic and non-rabbinic sources,⁸⁰ is distinguished further by a tradition actually linking his name with an all important event in Israel's early history:-⁸¹

"R. Johanan said: Wherever	א"ר יוחנן: כל אורה
the expression אור occurs	שנאמר באליהוא אינה
in the speeches of Elihu,	אלא בירידת גשמים.
it alludes to rain-fall.	ר' הושעיה אמר:
R. Hoshaiiah Rabbah said:	אינה אלא במתן
It alludes to the giving	תורה.
of the Law."	

As with other traditions relating to Elihu, the notion expressed by R. Hoshaiiah is an isolated one, unsupported by any exegetical examples.⁸² Nonetheless, its implications for those expositions of Elihu's utterances which have been preserved in our sources, may be important. For R. Hoshaiiah's statement is not simply a further example of the well-known homiletical

device equating אור with תורה, as is suggested by printed editions of Genesis Rabbah.⁸³ In taking אור as an allusion to מהן תורה - a reading supported by all manuscripts - R. Hoshaiah has invested אור in the context of Elihu's speeches with an historical significance. No basis for this exegetical device can be found in talmudic-midrashic literature, consequently, we can only assume that R. Hoshaiah's comment presupposes an extensive interpretation of Elihu's speeches with reference to the exodus and the wilderness, in which context, אור - the aggadic epithet for the Torah - figured as an allusion to the events at Sinai. This assumption is not entirely without some support, as will be seen particularly from the exposition of verses from chapter 33.

However, before proceeding to consider this material, there are several initial observations to be made regarding Elihu's speech in chapters 36-7, where the expression אור actually occurs.⁸⁴ It is possible that certain expressions and ideas in this speech suggested themselves to the early Aggadists as allusions to the events at Sinai, particularly the term הגה in 37:2,

שמעו שמוע ברגל קולו והגה מפיו יצא . The connection between הגה, in both its nominal and verbal forms, and the Torah, is the subject of a detailed and exhaustive study.⁸⁵ For our purposes we may note that

הגה in this verse is actually interpreted in our sources as דברי תורה.⁸⁶ It is further possible that the expression קול in this verse was identified specifically with קול מתן תורה,⁸⁷ as is the case with verse 5 of this chapter, ירעם קל בקולו. As we have observed above, already in tannaitic times this verse was regarded as an allusion to God's miraculous manipulation of His voice at Sinai.⁸⁸ According to an unknown Aggadist, this same verse describes the ventriloquist-like effect God produced with His voice on Sinai, projecting it to all four points of the compass, as well as to the heavens and to the earth:⁸⁹

"ירעם קל בקולו נפלאות": מהו "ירעם"? כשנתן הקב"ה את התורה בסיני הראה בקולו לישראל פלאי פלאים.⁹⁰ כיצד? היה הקב"ה מדבר והקול יוצא ומחזיר בכל העולם. ישראל שומעין את הקול בא עליהם מן הדרום, והיו רצים לדרום לקבל את הקול, ומדרום נהפך להם לצפון והיו רצים לצפון, ומצפון נהפך למזרח והיו רצים למזרח, וממזרח נהפך להם למערב, והיו רצים למערב, ומן המערב נהפך להן מן השמים, והיו תולין עיניהן והיו נהפך בארץ, והיו מביטין לארץ שנאמר, "מן השמים השמיעך את קולו ליסרך (דבר' ד 36)", והיו ישראל אומרים זה לזה "והחכמה מאין תמצא? (אי' כ' ח 12)".

More substantial evidence has been preserved to suggest that the exposition of chapter 36 with reference to events at the exodus and in the wilderness, was more extensive. It is clear from our sources that verse 22 of this chapter in particular

was regarded as an observation or comment by Elihu on these events. The following exposition of this verse is especially significant as it alludes to the giving of the Law, God's role on this occasion being contrasted with His prowess as a warrior which He had demonstrated at the Red Sea:⁹¹

בא וראה שאין מדותיו של
הקב"ה כמדת בשר ודם. מלך בשר ודם אינו יכול להיות עושה
מלחמה ולהיות סופר ומלמד תינוקות, והקדוש ברוך הוא אינו
כן, אתמול בים כעושה מלחמה שנאמר "ה' איש מלחמה (שמות
ט' ו 3)", ואומר "בכחו רגע הים ובתבונתו מחץ רהב",⁹²
והיום במתן תורה, ירד ולמד תורה לבניו, וכן הוא אומר,
"הן קל ישגיב כחו מי כמוהו מורה".⁹³

Two further interpretations of this same verse are found in our sources, reflecting a single theme, God's treatment of Pharaoh and the Egyptians. We encountered above the notion that God purposely hardened the heart of Pharaoh in order to bring upon him a full measure of retribution.⁹⁴ The theme of the following two passages on the other hand, reflects a different tradition. Ample opportunity was granted to Pharaoh to repent and thereby avert the horror of the plagues. Presumably, this notion has an apologetic or polemical colouring, and is a reaction to the criticism current in Gnostic circles of God's conduct towards sinners. The Generation of the Flood, the Tower-builders, the Sodomites as well as the Egyptians were all regarded as victims of Divine injustice and

⁹⁵
maltreatment. In the following source, an anonymous teacher, in his exposition of verse 22, has employed the same homiletical device as in the passage quoted earlier, and which occurs frequently in statements of this nature, stressing the superiority of Divine qualities by contrasting them with those of man:⁹⁶

„ואמרת אליו ה' אלקי העברים וגו' כה אמר ה' בזאת תדע כי אני ה', הנה אנכי מכה ומטה אשר בידי על המים אשר ב'אור ונהפכו לדם': הה' ד' הן קל ישגיב בכחו מי כמוהו מורה", בנוהג שבעולם בשר ודם שהוא מבקש להביא רעה על שונאו, פתאום מביא עליו עד שלא ירגיע בו. והקדוש ברוך הוא מתרה לפרעה על כל מכה ומכה כדי שישוב בו, הדא הוא דכתיב „בזאת תדע כי אני ה'..... הנה אנכי נוגף את כל גבולך בצפרדעים"..... „שלה העז את מקנך.....".

("And you shall say unto him: The Lord God of the Hebrews etc.... Thus says the Lord: By this you shall know that I am the Lord. Behold I will smite the waters of the Nile with the rod which is in my hand, and they shall turn to blood (Ex. 7:16-17)!. Thus it is written, 'Behold God is supreme in His power (so that none can deliver from His hand), therefore, who like Him instructs (His creatures to repent and so avert their fate;⁹⁷ Job 36:22)?'. Normally when a human being wishes to inflict some harm upon his foe, he does so suddenly, before his foe realises it. But God gave due warning to Pharaoh with every plague, that he might thereby do repentance! Hence it is written, 'By this you shall know that I am the Lord etc....',

'Behold I will smite your border with frogs (Ex. 7:27)', send forth and hasten in your cattle (ibid., 9:19)'.").

In this passage, as in the exposition quoted earlier, we have suggested that יְשׁוּבָה has been taken as an internal hiph'il. By way of contrast, we may note the interpretation of this expression by the later 'Amora, R. Berechiah, who invests יְשׁוּבָה with a transitive meaning. God strengthens those who are to perform His will, and instructs sinners in the ways of

penitence: ⁹⁸ "וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֶל מֹשֶׁה הִשְׁכֵּם בִּבְקָר וּגּו' (שם' ט 13), "הה' ד' הן קל ישגוב בכחו מי כמוהו מורה": א'ר ברכיה: "הן" אחד, שכן בלשון יוני קורין לאחד "הן", כלומר אחד אלקינו, "ישגיב כחו" - מעצים כח הצדיקים לעשות רצונו, "ומי כמוהו מורה" - שהוא מורה דרך לעשות תשובה. וכן אתה מוצא במשה שהשגיב הקב"ה כחו ללכת בשליחותו ולעשות צויו, והיה מורה לפרעה הרשע שיעשה תשובה, שלא חפץ לשלוח המכה עד שיזהירונו שיעשה תשובה, שכן כתיב "השכם בבקר והתיצב לפני פרעה (שם' שם)". היה נותן כח במשה להשכים ולהתיצב לפני פרעה, והיה מורה דרך לפרעה כדי שיעשה תשובה, שכן כתיב "ואמרת אליו, כה אמר ה' אלקי העברים וגו' (שם)".

God's treatment of the Egyptians is reflected in the exposition of a further verse from this same chapter which has been preserved in a tannaitic source. According to an unknown Tanna, the expression וַיִּנְעַר in Exodus 14:27, alludes to the youthful angels into whose hands the Egyptians were delivered for punishment, as is indicated in Job 36:14: תמות בנער נפשו. It is interesting to note once again, that the anonymous

author of the following statement clearly regarded his proof-text from Job as an allusion to the Egyptians, and offers no basis for its application to his subject. This suggests that he already knew of some established association between this section of the Book of Job and the events of the exodus, upon which he has relied in his choice of proof-text:¹⁰⁰ "וינער ה' את מצרים" - מסרם: "בידי מלאכים נערים ובידי מלאכים אכזרים, שנאמר, 'ומלאך אכזרי אשלח בם (מש' י' 11)", ואומר, 'תמות בנער נפשם'."

One further verse from chapter 36 forms the basis of another homily relating to a wilderness-theme, Israel's encounter with the Midianites. Earlier in this study, we referred to the theme occurring widely in the Aggadah, Moses' unwillingness to accept his death.¹⁰¹ In a tannaitic source quoted above, based on verses from chapter 28, Moses is presented as acquiescing to his fate, when he was assured that his soul would not fall into the clutches of the Angel of Death. The following passage reflects a different notion found in our sources relating to Moses' ultimate acquiescence, that as a result of witnessing the defeat and annihilation of the Midianites, Moses

¹⁰² "נקום נקמת בני ישראל: לא יגרע מצדיק עיניו", מהו, לא (במד' ל' 2): "זש'ה, לא יגרע מצדיק עיניו? איך הקב'ה מונע מצדיק מה שרוצה לראות בעיניו, מלמד שהיה משה מתאווה לראות נקמת המדינים קודם שימות, ועליו נאמר, 'ישמח צדיק כי חזה נקם (תה' נ' 11)",

"ישמח צדיק" - זה משה, "כי הזה נקם" - נקמת מד'ן,
 בפעמיו ירחץ בדם הרשע (תה' שם) - זה בלעם.

As we indicated above, there is more substantial evidence for some association in rabbinic thought between Elihu's speech in chapter 33, and the events of the exodus and the wilderness. Series of verses from this chapter have been interpreted with reference to notable events recorded in the Pentateuch. In view of R. Hoshaiiah's statement quoted earlier, linking Elihu's name specifically with the events at Sinai, it is noteworthy that one such series, verses 22-24, has been taken as a comment by Elihu on the unfortunate aftermath of **מתן תורה**, the making of the Golden Calf. On perpetrating this sacrilegious act, the Children of Israel were condemned before God by the Angels of Destruction and would have been consigned to perdition had not Moses intervened on their behalf, reminding God of His covenant with the

¹⁰³ patriarchs: "ותקרב לשחת נפשו וחיתו לממתיים", מדבר כנגד ישראל בשעה שעשה את העגל, באו המלאכים והיו מקטרגים אותם באותה שעה, והוא שמשה אמר "כי יגורתי מפני האף והחמה ¹⁰⁴ (דבר' ט' 10)". מיד עמד משה באותה שעה חגר מתניו בתפלה והיה מלמד זכות על ישראל ומבקש רחמים לפני הקב"ה, ואיוב מפרשו "אם יש עליו מלאך מליץ" - ואין מלאך אלא משה, שנ' "וישלח מלאך ויציאנו ממצרים (במד' כ' 16)", ומה רחמים בקש עליהם? אלא אמר לפני הקב"ה: רבון העולמים, "למה ה' יחרה אפך בעמך (שמ' ל' ב' 11)". "ויחננו ויאמר פדעונו מרדת שחת מצאתי כפר", מהו כן? אלא אמר לו משה: רבון העולמים

יודע אני שהם חיבי מיתה שכך אמרת לי, "זוהי לאלהים יחרם
(שם' כ"ב 19)", אלא בבקשה ממך פדה אותם ממלאכי חבלה,
הזכר זכות אבותם, הזכור לאברהם ליצחק ולישראל עבדיך אשר
נשבעת להם בך (שם' ל"ב 13)".¹⁰⁵

It is possible to trace the exposition of one of this series of verses with reference to Israel's early history, back to tannaitic sources. The early Tanna, R. Tarphon, regarded Elihu's words in verse 24, not as an allusion to the Golden Calf, as in the above passage, but to God's presentation of the Manna to Israel. As in a previous quotation from the Mechilta, no basis is offered in the following passage for the application of the proof-text to the incident in question, which suggests once again that some association between this section of the Book of Job, and the events of the exodus and the wilderness, was acknowledged already in early times:¹⁰⁶

ר' טרפון אומר: "אינו יורד אלא על האופסים, כביכול פשט הקב"ה ידו ונטל תפלתן של אבותינו שהיו שכובים בעפר והוריד המן כטל לישראל שנאמר, "ויחננו ויאמר פדעו מרדת שחת מצאתי כפר".

"R. Tarphon said: The Manna came down upon the (out-stretched)¹⁰⁷ palms (of God), God, as it were, stretched forth His hands and took the prayers of our patriarchs who were reclining in the dust, and brought down the Manna like dew for Israel, as it is said, 'And He was gracious unto them (Israel), and said: Deliver them from descending into the pit (for want of food), for I

have found כפר (viz. the patriarchs)'.¹⁰⁸

A second series of verses from this same chapter are employed as the basis of a homily relating to a personality with whom Elihu is actually identified in rabbinic sources, Balaam. According to an anonymous Aggadist, a sinner, like Balaam, is not informed of the dreadful consequences of his evil ways. Once his fate has overtaken him, Satan reveals to him the cause of his downfall:¹⁰⁹ "ויבא אלהים אל בלעם לילה (במד' כ' ב' 20): "זש'ה "בחלום חזיון לילה בנפל תרדמה על אנשים בתנומות עלי משכב. אז יגלה אזן אנשים ובמסדרם יחתום להסיר אדם מעשה וגוה מגבר יכסה", מהו "מגבר יכסה"? העלים הקב'ה ממנו שהליכתו מאבדתו מן העולם, ומוליכו לבאר שחת, שבשעה שאדם הולך לחטא השטן מרקד לפניו, עד שהוא גומר את העבירה, כיון שאיבדו חוזר ומודיעו, שנאמר "הולך אחריה פתאום וגו', עד יפלה חץ כבדו (משלי ז' 3-22)", כך העלים הקב'ה מבלעם עד שהלך ואיבד את נפשו, משיצא מכבודו והלך ואיבד את נפשו וידע במה שהוא בו, התחיל לבקש על נפשו "תמות נפשי מות ישרים (במד' כ' ג' 10)".

The application of these verses from chapter 33 to the personality of Balaam warrants some consideration, as it may not be based purely on a verbal association with Numbers 22:20. Elihu's words in verse 15, bear a striking resemblance to a similar statement by Eliphaz in 4:12-13: ואלי דבר יגוב ותקח אונ' שמץ. מנהו. בשעפים מחזיונות לילה בנפל תרדמה על אנשים. These two verses are found widely in our sources as the scriptural basis for a description of God's method of

communicating with pagan prophets.¹¹⁰ Urbach suggests that this description - a version of which is quoted below - is not merely of an academic nature, but has its counterpart in the daily realities of Palestine in talmudic times, when the claim to prophecy and prophetic experience was made by pagans, Christians, and particularly Gnostics. Urbach suggests further that it was the intention of the Rabbis to portray Balaam as the biblical prototype for these latter-day claimants of the prophetic gift.¹¹¹ We may note, however, that in some sources, Elihu's words in 33:15, as well as those of Eliphaz quoted above, also occur as the basis for this homily. We would suggest, therefore, that 33:15f, like 4:12-13, was also regarded as a comment on pagan prophecy in general, and on the prototype, Balaam, in particular:¹¹²

למה נגלה על בלעם
לילה? לא היה ראוי לרוח הקודש אלא בלילה,¹¹³ לפי שכל נביאי
הגוים בלילה מדבר עמהם, וכן אליפז אומר, "ואלי דבר יגנב
ותקח אזני שמץ מנהו, בשעפים מחזיונות לילה בנפול תרדמה
על אנשיים.", וכן אליהוא אומר, "בחלום חזיון לילה בנפל
תרדמה על אנשיים."¹¹⁴

One further passage to be quoted in connection with chapter 33, contains a homily relating to Moses. According to an anonymous teacher, God tolerated Moses' refusal to obey His command concerning the mission to Egypt on three occasions. Only after this was Aaron summoned to share the distinction of

115

"כִּדָּה נִפְשׁוֹ מֵעֶבֶר בִּשְׁחָת וַחֲיָתוֹ בְּאוֹר: bearing the Divine word: תִּרְאֶה. הֵן כָּל אֱלֹהִים יַפְעֵל קֵל פְּעָמִים שְׁלוֹשׁ פְּעָמִים מִמֶּתִּין לָאָדָם שָׂאֵם עֲשֵׂה תְּשׁוּבָה מוֹטֵב, וְאִם לֹא הוּא מִגִּלְגַּל עָלָיו אֶת הָרָשׁוּנוֹת. וְכֵן אָתָּה מוֹצֵא כִּשְׂאֵמֶךָ הַקֵּב' לְמֹשֶׁה "לֵכָה וְאֶשְׁלַחְךָ אֶל פְּרַעֲה (שְׁמוֹת ג' 10)", אָמַר תַּחֲלֶה "וְהֵן לֹא יֵאֱמִינוּ לִי (שֵׁם, ד' 1)", וְאֵה' כִּבְ אָמַר "לֹא אִישׁ דְּבָרִים אֲנֹכִי (שֵׁם, 10)", וְאֵה' כִּבְ אָמַר "שְׁלַח נָא בְיָדְךָ וְשְׁלַח (שֵׁם, 13)", הָרִי שְׁלוֹשׁ פְּעָמִים, וְכִיּוֹן שֶׁלֹּא חֹזֵר בְּדִבְרָיו וְאָמַר "הֵן בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁמְעוּ אֵלַי וְאִיךָ יִשְׁמַעְנִי פְּרַעֲהָ? (שֵׁם ו' 12)", נִתְיַחַד הַדְּבָרִים עַל אֲהֲרֹן עִמּוֹ,¹¹⁶ הָה' דִּבְרָה "וְיִדְבַר ה' אֶל מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל אֲהֲרֹן.... (שֵׁם, 13)".

IV. The Speeches of Zophar

Zophar's speeches are limited to two chapters, 11 and 20, yet there is some evidence in our sources to suggest that the former of these was associated in rabbinic thought with a particular theme, the giving of the Law. We have seen above, that this motif was associated with the name of Elihu, and is also discernible¹¹⁷ in the aggadic exegesis of a speech of Eliphaz. The passages cited below, suggest that Zophar's speech in chapter 11 was regarded as his contribution to the discussion among his companions on the auspicious event of the Giving of the Law. In all probability, the key-verse of this chapter, which may have provided the basis of an even more extensive exposition on the subject of מִתֵּן תּוֹרָה than has actually been preserved in our sources, is verse 6, וַיִּגְדַּלְךָ מֵעֲלֻמוֹת חֲכָמָה כִּי כַפְלִים לְתוֹשִׁיָּה וְגו'.

In the following passage, this verse is expounded in connection with an unusual notion for which no parallels can be found in talmudic-midrashic literature. When Moses ascended Mount Sinai for a second time to receive the tablets of stone, these were engraved not only with the written code, but also with the Oral Law, a notion which clearly contradicts the well-known concept that the תורה שבעל פה was purposely preserved in this form, in order to be the exclusive possession of Israel.¹¹⁸ We may note that reference is made in a tannaitic statement to the first tablets containing the whole of the written Law, inscribed between the letters of the Decalogue:¹¹⁹ "ויאמר ה' אל משה פסל לך וגו' (שמ' ל' ד 1): "הה'ד ויגד לך תעלומות חכמה כי כפלים לתושיה ודע כי ישה לך קלוח מעונך". התחיל (משה) מצטער על שבור הלוחות ואמר לו הקב"ה: אל תצטער בלוחות הראשונות שלא היו (בהם) אלא עשרת הדברות בלבד, ובלוחות השניים אני נותן לך שיהא בהם הלכות מדרש ואגדות, הה'ד ויגד לך תעלומות חכמה כי כפלים לתושיה", ולא עוד אלא שאתה מבוסר שמחלתי לך על חטייה שלך, שנאמר "ודע כי ישה לך קלוח מעונך".¹²⁰

"And the Lord said to Moses: Hew for yourself etc.

(Ex. 34:1)'. Thus it is written, ויגד לך תעלומות

(lit. חכמה כי כפלים לתושיה ודע כי ישה לך קלוח מעונך

'And that He would show thee the secrets of wisdom,

that it is manifold in effectual working! Know,

therefore that God exacteth of thee less than thine

iniquity deserveth.')

[Moses] began to be troubled by the breaking of the tablets, but God said to him: Do not be troubled about the first tablets, since they contained only the Ten Commandments! On the second tablets which I am going to give you, there will be laws, Midrash and Aggadoth! Thus it is written, 'And He imparted to you the secrets of the Torah, for the Torah is two-fold'.¹²¹ Moreover, you are given the glad tidings that I have forgiven your sin, as it is said, 'And know that God has forgiven you your iniquity!'.¹²²

Verse 5 of this same chapter has been employed as the scriptural basis for one of the solutions found in our sources, for the problem presented by God's choice of location for the Divine Revelation, the barren and arid wilderness.¹²³ According to an unknown teacher, the wilderness, in its geographic extensiveness, was intended to symbolise the character of the Law which, in Zophar's words is without bounds:¹²⁴

ומפני מה נתנה במדבר?.....מה המדבר הזה אין לו סוף, כך דברי תורה אין להם סוף, שנאמר "ארובה מארץ מדה".

One further verse from chapter 11, has been used as the basis for a homily containing both well-known, and unusual aggadic elements relating to the events at Sinai and their association with Israel's deliverance from Egypt. Clause B of verse 11, וירא

אין הקב"ה דין את האדם, אלא בשעה, has been taken as Zophar's formulation of the well-known principle, instrumental in the redemption from Egypt, ולא יתבונן

125
בה . שהוא עומד בה . Had God judged Israel at the exodus in the light of the events at Sinai, which He could foresee, then their deliverance would not have taken place. Although He was aware of Israel's ultimate faithlessness, God declares, He had, nonetheless, heard their cry and delivered them. The passage is of further interest as it preserves an unusual explanation for Israel's misdemeanour in worshipping the Golden Calf.

When God descended in His Divine Throne-Chariot drawn by the four beasts described by Ezekiel, the Israelites

unhitched the calf and set it up as a deity: ¹²⁶ "וַיֹּאמֶר ה' "

ראה ראיתי את עני עמי (שמ' ג' ז') : הה'ד"כ כי הוא ידע מתי

שוא"ה ידע הקב"ה העם העתידיים לעשות שוא ונהרגים עליו 127

.....אלא "וירא און ולא יתבונן", כיצד? וגו'.....וכן

כשהיו ישראל במצרים, ראה הקב"ה מה שעתיד יין לעשות, הה'ד,

„וַיֹּאמֶר ה' רֹאה רֵאיוֹתַי", „רֵאיוֹתַי" לֹא נֹאמַר, אֲלֵא "רֹאה רֵאיוֹתַי"

אמר לו הקב"ה: משה, אתה רואה ראייה אחת, ואני רואה שתי

ראיות, אתה רואה אותך באיך לסיני ומקבלין תורת, ואני

רואה אותך מקבלין תורתִי, זהו "ראה", "ראיתי" - זו ראית

מעשה העגל, שנ' "ראיתי את העם הזה" ¹²⁸ (שם ל'ב 9) "כשאבוא

לְסִינִי לִיתֵן לָהֶם אֶת הַתּוֹרָה, אֲנִי יוֹרֵד בְּטַרְדָּמוּלִי שְׁלִי, שֶׁהָ

מתבוננים בי ושומטים אחד מהם ומכעיסים אותי בו, אף על פי

בן איני דנס לפי המעשים העתידין לעשות, אלא לפי הענין

130
.....ד השתא

Notes

1. See above, p. 22f.
2. See above, p. 33f, notes 2 and 3.
3. See above, p. 145.
4. See above, p. 134.
5. This phrase is of particular interest as it occurs in tannaitic sources. Two early Tannaim, R. Joshua b. Hananiah and R. Eleazar b. Hisma, regarded Ex. 17:8 as a **רשום**, a symbolic, or allegorical verse, representing a secondary meaning which has been expounded by Job in 8:11: "וַיָּבֹא עַמְלֵק וַיִּלָּחֶם עִם יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרִפְיֵיהֶם (שם' י' ז 8)". ר' יהושע ור' אלעזר בן חסמא אומר (ים): המקרא הזה רשום ומפורש על ידי איוב, שנ' "היגאה גומא בלא בצח ישגא אחו בלי מיס?", וכי איפשר לגומא להתגדל בלא ביצה? "הישגא אחו בלי מיס?", וכי איפשר לאחו בלי מיס? כך אי אפשר לשראל בלא תורה. ולפי שפרשו מדברי תורה לכך בא עליהם השונא, שאין השונא בא אלא על החטא ועל העבירה, לכך נאמר "וַיָּבֹא וְגו'" Cf Mechilta Beshallah, 'Amalek 1, p. 53a; Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yoḥai, p. 118; Tanh. OV, Beshallah 25; also Yalkut Beshallah 262. For the above interpretation of **רשום**, see Lauterbach, "The Ancient Jewish Allegorists in the Talmud and Midrash", JQR (NS) I, p. 300. Moreover, from the material quoted by Lauterbach (pp. 310 and 312), we see that the above Midrash presupposes two interpretations of the **דורשי**

רשומות: a) רפיון ידיים = רפידים (viz. a slackening of the hands from the observance of the Torah, an interpretation which R. Joshua himself accepted, see Bekhoroth 5b); b) תורה = מים, a well-known aggadic device which, if Lauterbach is correct regarding the high antiquity of the דורשי רשומות, may have originated with this early school of allegorists. It is further possible that the two expressions גומא and אחר suggested some association between Job 8:11 and the early period of Israel's history, in which context both these terms occur (cf Gen. 41:18 and Ex. 3:3).

6. See above, p. 138.

7. See above, p. 127.

8. Cf Mid. Tan., pp. 224-5, and the parallels cited by Hoffmann ad loc..

9. Presumably this equation of עוף with the מלאכי רבשטים may be based on Is. 6:2, רבשטים יעופף.

10. In ARN Vers. B, xxv, p. 52, this statement is ascribed to R. Shimon b. Jose, R. Shemuel b. Jose's contemporary.

11. In the longer recension of this Aggadah in ARN p. 156-7, this verse is presented as the funeral eulogy uttered by the Ministering Angels over Moses'

bier. It is interesting to note that in the Sephardi rite this same verse is used as a scriptural introduction to the memorial prayer when recited for a sage (cf Siddur Gaster, p. 205). It is possible that this custom is based upon the above legend.

12. See above, p. 140.

13. Ed. Buber III, p. 2; Old Version, wa-Yikra 1.

14. This quotation from Psalm 29 in connection with the events at Sinai, presupposes the exposition of this Psalm with reference to **תורה מן** already in tannaitic sources, cf Mechilta Jethro, 'Amalek 1, and ba-Hodhesh 1, pp. 57a and 62a (see also Yalkut on Psalms, 710).

15. Cf Num. R. 14:22; also Sifre Zutta to Num. 7:89 (ed. Horov. p. 254).

16. On the restriction of God's voice to Moses alone, cf also Num. R. 14:21; Sifre Num. 58, p. 15b; Mechilta beginning; Sifra to 1:1, p. 3b; see also note 90 below.

17. Cf GR 24:5, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 234.

18. Lit. "Then did He see it and declare it; He established it, yea, and searched it out. And unto man He said it". The object presupposed in these verses, and with which chapter 28:12ff deals, is **חכמה** which

in accordance with the well-known aggadic device, has been identified with **תורה** (see also the following note).

19. Presumably, the Midrash has equated **אדם** = **איש** = **משה**, on the basis of Num. 12:3, **והאיש משה ענו מאד**. The reading **זה משה** is supported by manuscript evidence (cf ed. T-A, ad loc., p. 234), and was known to Masnut, whose version of this aggadah contains a lengthy addition, which, judging by its style and language, probably formed part of Masnut's midrashic Vorlage (cf Mayan Gannim, ed. Buber, p. 90). However, in the other sources mentioned above, **אדם** has apparently been interpreted as referring to Israel, presumably on the basis of Ezek. 34:31, **ואתן צאני צאן מרעיתי, אדם** (see below). We may note further that an alternative interpretation of the expression **אדם** is given in Genesis Rabbah loc. cit., in the name of the Amora R. Judah b. R. Simon. Once again the verses 27-8 are associated with the subject of the Law. However, R. Judah has taken **לאדם** as **לא אדם** 'not to Adam!'. Despite His original intentions to bestow the Law upon Adam, when God saw his inability to observe six commandments, He decided to give the Law containing six hundred and thirteen injunctions to Adam's descendants (cf ed. T-A, loc. cit., and particularly

the exposition of verses 27-8, preserved in the MS commentary quoted by Theodor in his note to line 6).

It may be of some significance that R. Judah b. R. Simon has assumed that these verses refer to the creation period, and not to the time of the exodus. This is reflected also in a statement of R. Tanhuma in Ex. R. 40:1, quoted in full below. R. Tanhuma has associated verses 27-8 with the notion that the creation of the world was dependent upon the Torah, and its acceptance by Israel (cf also Shab. 98a). According to R. Tanhuma, *אז ראה* 'then He saw', refers to God at the time of the creation, when He foresaw Israel's acceptance of the Torah, and consequently proceeded with the creation of the world: *ויספח: אז ראה ויגם חקרה: צפה הקב"ה וראה שישראל מקבלין את התורה שאלולי כן לא ברא העולם, שנאמר, אז ראה ויספרה..."* , ומה כתיב אחרי? *"ויאמר לאדם" ואין אדם אלא ישראל, שנאמר, ואתן צאני צאן מרעיתי אדם."* *אז ראה ויספרה" - בסיני,* *"הכינה" - באהל מועד, ויגם חקרה" - בערבות מואב ב"אלה הדברים".* It is possible that both R. Judah b.

R. Simon and R. Tanhuma based their association of Job 28:27-8 with the creation period, primarily upon the phrase *אז ראה*, which may have been taken as a verbal link with Gen. 1, where the verb *ראה* occurs frequently. We would suggest, however, that these two teachers' expositions of verses 27-8 may reflect an aggadic trend in the exegesis of chapter 28, different from that

which we find in the sources quoted above relating to Moses. The parallel between verses 12-28 of this chapter and Proverbs 8, could hardly have escaped the notice of early Aggadists. The common theme of these two biblical passages, Wisdom and its origins, may have provided the basis for similar espositions in rabbinic circles. Just as Proverbs 8 was regarded as a description of the cosmic role of חכמה = תורה, at the time of the creation, so Job 28:12ff may have been subjected to a similar exposition, of which the statements of the above two Amoraim are only a remnant.

One further passage which we may note in this context, while presupposing the fuller exposition of Job 28:27 which we find in other sources, does contain an interesting feature of its own (cf Tanh. OV, Yithro 15): ... שכן מצינו בקדוש ב'ה שהוא נותן מענה לשון לכל הבריות, והתורה גלויה לפניו ככוכב (נ'א: ככתם) אחד, וכשבא ליתן אותה לישראל כתיב בו "אז ראה ויספרה הכינה וגו'"...

The operative expression in this passage which calls for elucidation, is כוכב. To translate this expression literally, "The Torah is revealed before Him like a star", is hardly satisfactory. Nor would the translation of the passage be improved, if we were to adopt the alternative reading, כתם. We would suggest, therefore, that in this context, כוכב is to be equated with HERMES = HERMENEUS TOU NOMOU (= דורש התורה) = "Law-Interpreter", hence, "All the Torah is revealed

before Him, as before a master-expositor of the Law" (cf N. Wieder, "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses", JJS IV, 1953, p. 165ff).

20. In Exodus Rabbah, as well as both versions of the Tanḥuma cited above, Job 28:28 is also applied to Miriam, who, for her fear of God at the time of Pharaoh's wicked decree, was rewarded with Bezalel, who was filled with the spirit of חכמה.

21. The Targum to this chapter already introduces an allusion to the fate of Pharaoh (cf Targum B to verse 6):
היך פרעה דאיתיה קלוח לאשר הביא קלוח בידו
עלוי מחתא בידיה.

22. Cf Ex. R. 15:10. It is possible that an allusion to the plagues was found in verse 25, ימשו חשך ולא
וימש חשך, suggesting Ex. 10:21, אור.

23. Published by Mann under the title of a "New Midrash on the Torah", in "The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue", Cincinnati 1940, Hebrew Section, pp.216-7.

24. This being the proemial verse with which the Midrash to this Sedher opens.

25. Cf Targum Ps. Jon. to Ex. 12:12; Ex. R. 15:15;

Suk. 29b; Tanh. B. V, p. 32.

26. Cf Mechilta Beshallah ii, 2, p. 27b-28a; also Lekah to Ex. 10:10.

27. Cf Mechilta Bo, Pisha 13, p. 13b; also Beshallah i, p. 26a; Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai pp. 28 and 48; Ex. R. loc. cit.; also Targum Ps. Jon. to Ex. 14:2 (see also Rashi ad loc.).

28. It is possible that the allusion to Baal Zaphon in chapter 12, was found, once again, in verse 25, **יִמְשֹׁ חֶשֶׁךְ**, **חֶשֶׁךְ** being closely associated in the Aggadah with **צָפוֹן**, "the north" (cf Num. R. 2:10 and 3:12):

צָפוֹן, מִשֶּׁם חוֹשֶׁךְ יוֹצֵא לְעוֹלָם.

29. Cf Ex. R. 3:8; and parallels cited ad loc; also Num. R. 15:17; Tanh. B. II, p. 16; *ibid.*, III, p. 58; Old Vers. Shemoth 29; Shemini 11; be-Ha'alotheekha 13.

30. Cf Ex. R. 16:1.

31. It is most probable that the Midrash has interpreted the continuation of Ex. 12:21, as a two-fold injunction, **וַיִּקְחוּ לָכֶם** was addressed to the elders that they themselves should accept Moses' words, **מִשְׁכּוֹ** implying that they should "draw" the rest of Israel in their wake. According to Einhorn (ad loc.), Job 12:11 is presupposed by this Aggadah: **הֲלֹא אָזָן מִלֵּין חִבְחָן**, "Because their ears tested and

accepted Moses' words, they caused Israel (יטעים = יטעם) to taste אכל (= the paschal lamb, on the basis of Ex. 12:8, ואכלו את הבשר).

32. For the many sources in which this Aggadah occurs, cf Ginzberg, "Legends of the Jews" VI, pp. 30-1, note 181.

33. For parallels, see Theodor loc. cit..

34. Although this verse is not found in printed editions, it appears in MSS London, Paris, Munich, Vatican, Stuttgart, Oxford 1 and 2.

35. Apart from the expositions of verses 10 and 23, included above, our sources have preserved an interpretation of only one further verse from this chapter, verse 4, חכם לבב ואמיץ כח, מי הקשה אליו וישלם. According to an unknown teacher, this verse signified God's invincible power over those who oppose Him, culminating in the defeat of Pharaoh (cf Tanh. B. II, p. 53-4, and the parallels cited by Buber ad. loc.; Sepher we-Hizhir, 19a; see also Ex. R. 18:4):
 "וי'יהי בשלח פרעה וגו' (שמ' י' ג' 17): "זש'ה "חכם לבב ואמיץ כח מי הקשה אליו וישלם", "חכם לבב" - זה הקב'ה, שנ' "עמו חכמה וגבורה וגו' (אי' י' ב' 13)", "מי הקשה אליו וישלם" - דור המבול נתקשו כנגדו ושטפן במים, דור הפלגה נתקשו כנגדו הפיצם בכל העולם, אנשי סדום נתקשו כנגדו, מה היה סופן?
 "וה' המטיר על סדום (ברא' י"ט 24)". פרעה אמר "מי ה'?"
 (שמ' ה' 2), "והקב'ה אמר לו "שלח את עמי (שם, 1)", ואף

הוא נהקשר, שג' הויהי כי הקטה פרעה לשלחנו (שם י' ג 15) „ כיון שבאת מכת הבכורות עליו מיד שלחן, לכך נאמר וגו'... „

The additional quotation, Job 12:13, warrants some comment. Although not found in all manuscripts, Buber regards this as the correct reading. It is difficult to understand, however, why this additional verse was required. That Job 9:4 refers to God is obvious from context. We would suggest, therefore, that 12:13 was quoted in order to support the implication that God's might in His treatment of His creatures is also a display of חכמה. This could not be deduced from chapter 9, which continues with a description of God as the ruler of the creation, while chapter 12, 13ff is a description of God's ability to overcome the mightiest of mortals and to thwart their plans.

36. Mann, op. cit., p. 237.

37. As Mann suggests, the association of this verse with Sedher Yithro is probably based on the expression עושה which echoes Ex. 18:1, אשר עשה אלקים, also Is. 33:13, שמעו רחוקים אשר עשיתי, the corresponding Haftarah for this Sedher. We would suggest further that the association of verse 9 with the events at Sinai, may reflect the wider notion that Job and his companions were contemporaries of the exodus, and, therefore, witnessed the revelation at Sinai above, pp. 22f). For the context in which this verse occurs,

is a description of Job's experience of the Divine (see particularly verse 11). From the material quoted above, we see that similar descriptions in the speeches of Eliphaz and Elihu were taken as an allusion to the Divine revelation at Sinai (see p. 136 on 4:15-16; also p. 139f on 37:1f). It is highly probable, therefore, that Job's comments on this subject were also taken as an allusion to the same event. The association of Job 5:9 with the exodus is reflected further in the daily liturgy, cf Siddur Singer (new ed.) p. 120.

38. The association between Jethro's conversion and the Manna is reflected in the exposition of a further utterance of Job, 31:32 (cf Ex. R. 27:5): "בחוץ לא ילין גר... דלתי לארח אפתח", זה יתרו שהודיד לו הקדוש ברוך הוא את המן, שנאמר "ויצו שהקים ממעל וגו' וימטר עליהם מן ה'". The Midrash here presupposes that God is the speaker in 31:32, and not Job, see further Ex. R. 19:4, where Job apparently imputes these words to God: אמר איוב "בחוץ לא ילין גר", שאין הקדוש ברוך הוא פוסל לבריה אלא לכל הוא מקבל..... "דלתי לארח אפתח", כנגד הקדוש ברוך הוא שהוא סובל בריותיו.

39. Cf Mechilta Yithro, 'Amalek 1, pp. 56b-57a; Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yoḥai, p. 127, and the parallels cited ad loc..

40. See further Ex. R. 18:10, which refers to the worthy among the Egyptians participating in the first Paschal feast and the exodus.

41. Cf "Vita Mosis" i, 27.
42. The exodus being the theme of a play by the Hellenistic-Jewish tragedian, Ezekiel. As Rapaport observes, this work was probably written for non-Jewish audiences, and was intended, therefore, to disseminate knowledge of the power and superiority of the Jewish God (cf "Jewish Religious Propaganda and Proselytism in the period of the Second Commonwealth", Jerusalem 1966, p. 108).
43. Cf sources quoted in note 48 below.
44. Cf Ex. R. 5:22 (on Ex. 5:22-3).
45. Cf R. Levi's comment on this verse, cited above, p. 62.
46. This theme forms the basis of accounts and legends in rabbinic sources, which have been collected by Ginzberg, "Legends of the Jews" III, p. 419ff, and notes 876ff, Vol. VI, p. 147ff.
47. Cf Tanḥ. B. V, pp. 8-9; *ibid.*, p. 7; Yalkut to wa-Ethḥannan, 811.
48. Cf Ex. R. loc. cit.; Tanḥ. B II, p. 21; Tanḥ. (OV) wa-'Era', 6; Berakh. 32a; TBA 4, p. 17.
49. Moses' ability to command God is expressly

mentioned in our sources in connection with Job 22:28,
 'והגזר אמר ויקם לך וגו'. According to R. Levi, just as
 God commanded Moses, so Moses could command God (Ex. R.
 21:2) "מה תצעק אלי (שמ' י' ד 15): "הה' ד" והגזר אמר ויקם:
 לך", א'ר לוי כשם שהקב'ה מצוה למשה ומדבר עמו, כך היה
 משה מצוה כביכול לפני הקב'ה, שכן בני יוסף אומרים לו "את
 אדני צוה ה'.... ואדני צוה (= פִּעֵל) בה' (במד' ל' ו 6)".
 וכשם שהקב'ה קורא למשה ומדבר עמו, כך היה משה קורא
 להקב'ה ומדבר עמו, שנ' "וידבר ה' אל משה לאמר", וכתיב
 "וידבר משה אל ה' לאמר: יפקוד ה' אלקי הרוחות (שם כ' ז,
 15-16)". ראה כמה היה שולט וכשראה את פרעה רודף אחרי בני
 ישראל, בא לצעוק שנ' "ויאמר ה' אל משה מה תצעק אלי?",
 א'ל: למה אתה מצטער? א'ר יהושע: משל לאוהבו של מלך שהיה
 לו עסק, הלך לצעוק לפני המלך, אמר לו המלך: מה אתה צועק?
 גזר ואני אעשה. כך אמר הקב'ה למשה "מה תצעק אלי" דבר
 ואני עושה.

50. This Aggadah is quoted in Yalkut Job 907, apparently
 from the lost Yelammedenu.

51. The Midrash here may presuppose the early Aggadah
 recorded in GR 87:10, and the parallels cited by
 Theodor ad loc., p. 1075, regarding Joseph's pious
 determination in resisting the overtures of Potiphar's
 wife even in prison.

52. Cf "Quis Haeres sit" VI, 19ff.

53. Quoting several examples of Moses' forthright
 speech in the Bible, including two verses which are
 the subject of similar comment in rabbinic Aggadah,
 Ex. 5:22 (see above, note 44), and Num. 11:22, cited in

the Tanhuma passage above (p. 130) as a particularly harsh statement of Moses.

54. Unfortunately, rabbinic sources are not so explicit as Philo in drawing parallels between the bold utterances of Abraham and Moses. It is interesting to note, however, that just as Moses is depicted as speaking boldly to God on the subject of His אומנות, His "characteristic virtue", so Abraham is portrayed as warning God that His destruction of the Sodomites might convince His creatures that His אומנות is cruelty! However, God's words in Job 41:4, ... 'לֹא אַחֲרַיִשׁ בְּדִיר וְגו' are taken as a declaration granting Abraham the right to speak to Him as no other creature might (cf Tanh. B I, p. 91; and compare the parallel passage in GR 49:10, ed. T-A, p. 512, where, in connection with the same proof-text, this privilege is extended also to Joshua, David and Moses). One further passage of note (Num. R. 15:14, end), which echoes Philo's homily, asserts that Abraham and Moses both merited kingship because they demonstrated their reverence for God.

55. Cf Tanh. B. IV, p. 121; OV, Huk̄kath 10; Num. R. 19:10. On the possibility of some association between Palestinian Aggadah and Philo's concept of love and fear, and their relationship to the Divine names, see J. Amir, "Philo's Homilies on Love and Fear, and their

relationship to Palestinian Midrashim", Zion XXX (1965), pp. 47-60. Amir, however, has not noted the parallels in rabbinic sources cited above, for some of the elements in Philo's writings.

56. Cf p. 378 , below.

57. Our sources do preserve an exposition of this verse relating to quite a different theme from that reflected in the Targum. According to an unknown Aggadist, verse 13, refers to the predicament of Moses, when challenged by the people to bring forth water from a rock other than that indicated by God (cf Tanh. B IV, p. 120; OV Huk̄kath 9; Num. R. 19:9, also Einhorn ad loc.).

58. Compare the midrashic interpretation of Ex. 18:11, אֲשֶׁר זָדוּ עָלָיו; Targ. Onk. and Ps. Jon., ad loc.; Soṭah 11a; also Mechilta Yithro, 'Amalek 1, p. 59a; Ex. R. 22:1; Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yoḥai, p. 66; on the magicians, see also Ex. R. 1:18.

59. It was probably this verse in particular which suggested a relationship between this passage and the Egyptians (see also note 22 above).

60. The precise allusion here is doubtful. It may be simply a reference to the dearth of food created by the plagues.

61. Once again, the allusion here is obscure. The notion that the clouds protected and cared for Israel on various occasions, occurs widely in our sources (cf the statement of R. Jose, above p. 125; also the numerous sources collected by Ginzberg, see "Legends of the Jews", index, sub "Clouds, Israel protected and cared for by the,", p. 89). However, we can find no parallel for the notion expressed above, that the clouds protected Israel also on the occasion of Balaam's attempt to curse them.

62. The Targumist is once again referring to aggadic material of which we can find no trace in existing sources.

63. For the great publicity surrounding the giving of the Law, cf Mechilta Yithro, ba-Hodhesh 1, p. 62a; see also Ginzberg op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 32, note 185. On the giving of the Law in the wilderness, see also above, p. 151.

64. It is interesting to note that Masnut (cf Mayan Gannim on Job ad loc., ed. Buber p. 21) knew of further allegorical expositions of verses 22ff of this chapter, for which no parallels can be found. Quoting from an unidentified aggadic source, Masnut presents the opposing views of R. Joshua b. Levi and R. Shemuel b.

Nahman, the former applying these verses to Jacob, the latter to David's troubles with Saul, Doeg and Ahitophel. It is highly likely that a similar exposition relating to the exodus and the wilderness, also existed and was known to the Aramaic translator of Job. It is even possible that a fragment of this exposition has been preserved in older sources (cf PK p. 70b, ed. Mandel. p. 139f, and the parallels cited ad loc.), which record a number of interpretations of verse 5, one of which does accord with the chronological order followed by the Targum. As we noted above, the earlier verses of chapter 5, have been related specifically to the exodus. in the following passage, verse 5 has been associated with Moses and Aaron, and their triumph over Pharaoh:

„אשר קצירו" - זה פרעה - „רעב יאכל" - זה משה ואהרן -
 „ואל מצנים יקחהו" - לא בזין ולא במגן אלא בתפלה
 ובתחנונים, שנאמר „ויאמר ה' אל משה: מה תצעק אלי דבר
 אל בני ישראל ויסעו". „ושאף צמים חילם" - מי דחק לממונו
 של פרעה? משה ואהרן וכל המצומתים להם.

"'Whose harvest' - referring to Pharaoh - 'the hungry consumes' - referring to Moses and Aaron; ואל מצנים יקחהו meaning, without weapons or shields they will seize it , but through prayers and supplications, as it is said, 'And the Lord said to Moses: Why do you cry out (= pray) unto Me? speak to the Children of Israel and let them journey forward (Ex. 14:15)';
 „ושאף צמים חילם Who trampled upon the wealth of

Pharaoh? Moses, Aaron and all their followers!".

In all probability, the Midrash has taken the continuation of Job 5:5, as "The unarmed ones will take it, and their associates will trample upon their (= the Egyptians') wealth.", taking **וְאֵל מִצְנִיִּים** as **וְאֵל מִצְנִיִּים**, associating **מִצְנִיִּים** with **צֹנָה**, a shield, as is explicitly stated in Esther R. 9:9, where Psalms 91:4, **צֹנָה וְסוּחָרָה** is adduced as the proof-text. Moreover, **שֹׁף** has been equated with **שֹׁף** (the interchange between media - ו and media - א occurring between Hebrew and Aramaic, compare **קום** = **קאם**). Finally, **צִמִּים** has been associated with **צִמָּה** "to heep", hence "to gather together", "to summon", and in the pu'al, **מִצְמָה** "a follower". On the allusion to Moses' praying in Ex. 14:15, cf Targ. Onk. and both Palestinian Targumim, also Rashi ad loc.. See also the further interpretation of Job 5:5, included in the sources cited above, with reference to Moses' defeat of Og and Sihon.

65. Cf Num. R. 18:15. The association of this passage with Korah, probably arises from verse 34, **וְאֵשׁ אֵכְלָה**, which has been taken as an historical pointer to Num. 16:11 and 27.

66. Viz. KATHOLIKOS, "financial officer", "controller" (compare Ex. R. 37:1). Apart from an allusion in PT San. x, p. 27d, to Pharaoh's treasures having been

revealed to Korah, the tradition preserved in this source has no parallels in older sources (see, however, the material cited by Ginzberg op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 99, note 560, which refers to Korah's great wealth, a tradition which, presumably, gained wide currency in talmudic times (cf Targum Ps. Jon. to Num. 16:19). We may note further that this tradition locating Korah within the retinue of Pharaoh, coincides exactly with the historical setting suggested for Job, who is also portrayed as a member of Pharaoh's **פמליא** (see above, p. 38, note 14). Consequently, Eliphaz' speech was evidently regarded as a contemporary account of Korah's activities and fate.

67. It is probable that **יונקתו** in this verse has been taken as **מינקת** (**ינק**), viz. "she who suckled his children", "his wife", the use of **kal** for **hiph'il** being a feature of Palestinian Hebrew.

68. Viz. "She extinguished it" (see Einhorn ad loc.), taking **כיבת** as the Neo-Hebrew equivalent of the biblical form, **כיבתה**.

69. On Samuel as a descendant of Korah, cf Num. R. *ibid.*, 8; Tanh. B. IV, p. 89; OV, Korah 5.

70. This emendation of the text is based upon Luria ad loc.; printed editions read: **אל תאמינו תועה הוא אל**

71. We have rendered this phrase (below, note 73) as, "The column of smoke from his incense will be in vain, and his grave will be filled before its time!". This rendering is based upon the assumption that the Midrash has equated תמורה in verse 31 with the denominative verb תמר, "to rise up in a straight column", referring particularly to the smoke of incense (cf Tosephta Yoma 2:6, ed Zucker. p. 184, and the sources cited by Jastrow, sub תמר, p. 1678). As such this rendering presupposes the Aggadah that Korah persisted in offering the incense, despite Moses' warning of the fatal consequences of his action, because Korah deceived himself that his life would not be forfeited in view of his illustrious progeny. (cf Ex. R. 18:8, also the parallel cited above from the Tanhuma, which clearly underlies the interpretation of verses 30ff in our source above).

72. Presumably, the Midrash has equated בסרו with hence "a wife", on the basis of Gen. 2:23. A little clearer is the imagery of נצה "a blossom", as children, compare פרח metaphorically used as "a young man", as in פרחי כהונה (cf Midd. 1:8).

73. "Job said:.....וישכן ערים נכחדות. 'He dwelt in secret cities (Job 15:28)', this refers to Korah,

who was the fiscal officer to the household of Pharaoh, and the keys of his treasuries were in Korah's possession. But God said to him: What benefit will you derive from your office? You will not continue to hold sway over these treasures, as it is said, 'He dwelt in houses which he would not continue to inhabit, but which were destined for the exiles (ibid.)' - for whom were they intended? for those who were to be 'exiled', namely, for Israel who were 'exiled' from Egypt! As for Korah, לא יעשר ולא יקום חילו (ibid., 29), 'He shall not be rich nor shall his substance continue!', even after his death, his wealth was not to survive (as he had no heirs). לא יסור מני השך לעולם (ibid. 30), 'He will never depart from the darkness [of the underworld]',

יונקתו תיבש שלהבת (ibid.), 'His wife extinguishes the flame of Gehinnom'. Our Rabbis said: When Korah's wife descended into Gehinnom, she extinguished it with the flame of her body ! ויסור ברוח פיו (ibid.), 'And he departs with his breath in his mouth (viz. unable to utter a word)', in order that he might not say, 'Samuel is in future to be my descendant, and on his account I should be spared!'. Nonetheless, 'He will depart with his breath in his mouth'. אל יאמן בשוא

(ibid. 31-32). נתעה כי שוא תהיה תמורתו, בלא יומו תמלא. On that occasion, God cried out to the two hundred and fifty men who had cast their lot in with Korah, 'Do not

believe him! He errs (in thinking that his illustrious descendant can save him from his punishment). Do not believe him for he errs after vanity! The column of smoke from his incense will be in vain, and his grave will be filled before its time (on account of his presumption!'), even before his time to die has arrived, he kills himself!''.

74. Cf ARN Vers. B, xxxviii, p. 101. We have emended the text extensively, particularly on the basis of the Sifre to Deut. 32:17 (318, p. 136b; see also Rashi to Deut. ad loc.). The allusion to the raising of the hair is clearly contained in the continuation of verse 15, which is omitted in the printed text, but which we have added above.

75. Cf Ex. R. 30:11.

76. Compare, however, Jastrow's rendering of this phrase (sub מִשְׁפָּט p. 857): "In the morning the Law (viz. religious principles) was given, and in the evening the civil law". This rendering is hardly satisfactory as no support can be found in our sources for the notion that the civil legislation was instituted merely to ensure the performance of the religious injunctions.

77. The allusion to the Torah in this passage, presupposes the preceding verse in Job: אֵלֶּיךָ מִתְּהוֹמֹתַי

בהכמה. In rendering משים as "judgements", we have assumed that the Midrash here presupposes an exposition of 4:20 which occurs in a tannaitic source quoted below (p. 330). Commenting on this verse, R.

Meir observes: ואין "משים" אלא דין, המד' א"ו אלה

However, R. Meir's exposition of both verses 20 and 21 of this chapter was made with reference to the Generation of the Flood.

78. Which is the rendering offered by Jastrow (p. 747; sub מוקמא). MK ad loc., following the 'Arukh, translates מוקמא as "work" (מוקמא being a stand upon which, presumably, the workman operate), hence, "It may be compared to two men who embark upon a job, a skilled and an unskilled labourer".

79. Possibly this verse was taken as an allusion to the giving of the Law on the basis of the continuation ואשיב נקם לצרי ולמשנאי אשלם which is reminiscent of Ex. 20:8. As to the notion expressed in this passage that the legislative code contained in Sedher Mishpatim was given in the afternoon of the same day as the giving of the Law, this may have been derived simply from the notion that this code is the supplement of the Decalogue (cf Mechilta Mishpatim 1, 74b; Ex. R. loc. cit., 3), and, therefore, the natural corollary of the Ten Commandments in time as well as content.

80. Cf below, p. 284f, also p. 20 above.

81. Cf GR 26:7 (ed. T-A, p. 255).

82. However, we find the expression **אור** in 37:21, **אור לא ראו אור** interpreted as an allusion to the Torah (cf R. Joseph's interpretation of this verse in Ta'an 7b; also Targum B to Job ad loc.). Although no allusion is made in this passage to the historical event of the giving of the Law, as is suggested by R. Hoshaiah.

83. Which adds the proof-text from Proverbs, 6:23

כי נר מצוה ותורה אור. This verse is found in none of the manuscripts of Genesis Rabbah cited by Theodor ad loc.. In all probability, it was introduced erroneously into the text as an elucidation of R. Hoshaiah's statement (cf Theodor ad loc.).

84. Cf 36:30 and 32; 37:3, 11, 15 and 21.

85. Cf N. Wieder, "The Judaeae Scrolls and Karaism", East-West Library, 1962, p. 215ff.

86. Cf GR 49:2 and 64:4 (ed. T-A, pp. 501 and 704):

**ואין "הגה" אלא דברי תורה כמד'א "והגית בו ימים ולילות
(יהושע א, 8)".**

87. See also the lengthy homily quoted from the Tanhuma above (p. 118), where the expression **קול** in Psalms 29:5, Num. 7:89 and Job 28:26, has been identified with

קול מהן תורה which suggests a tendency in the Aggadah for which other examples may be found, to equate the voice of God (viz. 'קול ה', בקול, or, as in our text, קולו) specifically with the miraculous voice employed at the time of the revelation (cf Ex. 19:19, והאלקים יענינו בקול).

88. Cf p. 119 above.

89. Cf Ex. R. 5:9; also Tanh. B. II, p. 13; OV Shemoth 25. On the notion that God's voice was heard from all four points of the compass, cf Sifre Deut. 314 (p. 135a) and 343 (p. 142b).

90. Like Ben 'Azzai quoted above, the unknown author of this statement has equated ירעם (lit. "He thundereth") with יראם ("He shows them"), interchanging y with x. This same interpretation is presupposed in the following passage relating to the summoning of Aaron as well as Moses, at the beginning of their mission. God's voice went forth on a dual transmission, reaching both Moses in Midian, and Aaron in Egypt, although it was heard by no other creature (cf Tanh. B. II, p. 14; OV Shemoth, 26; also Ex. R. 5:9 end): "ירעם קל בקולו נפלאות", אימתי עשה הקב"ה בקולו נפלאות? בשעה שבקש הקב"ה לשלוח משה בשליחותו לגאול את ישראל, והיה במדין מתירא שברח מפני פרעה שמא יהרגנו שנאמר "ויברח משה מפני פרעה וגו' (שמ' ב' 15)", כיון שנגלה עליו הדבור במדין ואמר לו שיחזור למצרים, שנ' "ויאמר ה' אל

משה במדין לך שוב מצרימה (שם ד' 19), "נהלק הדבור לשני קולות ונעשה דין פרצופין ושמע משה במדין לך שוב למצרים, ואהרון שמע במצרים לך לקראת משה, ומה שבאמצע לא היו שומעין כלום, הרי ה' ירעם קל בקולו נפלאות".

("'God showed them wonders with His voice': When did God perform wonders with His voice? At the time when He wanted to send Moses on His embassy to redeem Israel, while he (Moses) was in Midian, afraid, as he had fled from before Pharaoh lest he slay him, as it is said, 'And Moses fled from before Pharaoh etc. (Ex. 2:15)'. When the Divine word was revealed to him in Midian, and he was told that he should return to Egypt - as it is said, 'And the Lord said to Moses in Midian: Go, return to Egypt! (ibid., 4:19)' - at that time the Divine word was divided into two voices, assuming a double character (viz. DIPROSOPOS, lit. 'double-faced'), so that Moses heard in Midian, 'Go return to Egypt!', while Aaron heard in Egypt, 'Go, meet Moses in the wilderness!'. However, any one between the two did not hear a thing! This is the significance of 'God showed them wonders with His voice'.").

91. Cf Ex. R. 28:5.

92. The inclusion of Job 26:12 - which deals with God's victory over the Sea (viz. Rahab, see below, p. 195f) - in a context referring to the drowning of the Egyptians, is unusual, unless we assume that this is a

transformation of a wider mythological tendency, whereby God's victory over the Egyptians at the Red Sea was equated with, and superseded the older notion of God's victorious battle against the Sea (cf particularly S.E. Löwenstamm, "The Tradition of the Exodus and its Development", Jerusalem 1965, p. 108ff).

93. Lit. "Behold God doeth loftily in His power etc.".

It is possible that the Midrash has equated the biblical

יִשְׁגִּיב (hiph'il) with the later expression יִשְׁגֹּב (viz. pi'el), "to overpower", thus "God overpowers in His strength"; cf Tem. 16a, שלא יִשְׁגֹּבֵי יְצֵה'ר מלשנות.....

In connection with this Aggadah, compare the maxim (AZ 17b):
אִי סִיפָא לֹא סַפְרָא, אִי סַפְרָא לֹא סִיפָא.

94. See above, p. 122.

95. Cf Marmorstein, "The Background to the Aggadah", HUCA VI, 1929, p. 159.

96. Cf Ex. R. 9:9; also Tanḥ. B. II, p. 33.

97. This interpretation of clause B is expressly stated in Tanḥuma loc. cit. (see also Rashi on Job ad loc.):

„מִי כְמוֹהוּ מוֹרָה׃ - שְׁמוֹרָה רַשְׁעִים שִׁיעֲשׂוּ תְּשׁוּבָה.

98. Cf Ex. R. 12:1; also PK 24, p. 158b (ed. Mandel. p. 354).

99. Cf Targum to Job ad loc., ...הָא בְּלַחְוִדוּהִי קִלְתָּ תְּקִיף.

R. Berechiah appears to have favoured this interpretation of η and resorts to it elsewhere (cf PK 9, p. 77b, ed. Mandel. p. 156, on Is. 41:24; see also Buber's comment ad loc.).

100. Cf Mechilta Beshallah ii, 6, p. 33a; also Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai, p. 67. See also the opposing view that God rejected the help of the angels, and did battle with the Egyptians alone, PR 21, 104a; ARN Vers. A xxvii, p. 83; Num. R. 8:3. On the suffering of the Egyptians at the time of their death, see also Mechilta Beshallah, Shirtha 6, p. 40a; Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai, p. 87, where on the basis of Job 41:23 ($\text{יִרְתִּיחַ כְּסִיר מְצוּלָה יָם יֹשִׁים כְּמַרְקָחָה}$), the souls of the Egyptians are described as being trapped within their bodies, as though within "skin bottles securely tied, neither admitting nor releasing air!".

101. Cf p. 116, and note 46 above.

102. Cf Tanh. B. IV, p. 159; OV, Matṭoth 4; Num. R. 22:5. The above Aggadah presupposes a longer account preserved in the Yalkut to Matṭoth, 785, from the lost Yelammedhenu, where Moses is depicted as ultimately accepting his fate, so long as he might the subjugation of the Midianites before his death (see also Sifre Num. 157, p. 59a; according to this source, Moses' death was

held over only for the duration of the war with the Midianites. Nonetheless, he accepted this salvation with joy.

103. Cf PR 10, p. 38b.

104. The Midrash here alludes to a notion which occurs widely in our sources, the enmity of the angels either towards Moses, or towards Israel at the time of the giving of the Law, cf Nedharim 32a; PR 10, p. 37b; Sifra (Baraita of R. Ishmael) p. 3a end; Tanh. B. V, p. 51; Mid. Psalms on 7:6, ed. Buber p. 65-66; Ex. R. 44:3; PRE 46. It is of especial interest for our study that this notion was associated in particular with a verse from Job, 26:9, **מֵאֲחֹזַן פָּנָיו כִּסָּא פִּרְשָׁיו עָלָיו עָנָנוּ**, cf Ex. R. 42:4, also 41:7; Tanh. B. II, p. 113; see also Buber's comments ad loc.; Shab. 88b; Suk. 5a. As the material referred to here requires a more detailed study, which is beyond the context of this note. Nonetheless, we may note a possibility suggested already by Altmann (cf "The Rabbinic Adam Legends", JQR XXXV, 1944-45, p. 371), that there is some association between the opposition of the angels to Moses, and a similar tradition relating to Adam.

105. We may note further, that Elihu's words in 34:24,

יָרַע כְּבִירִים לֹא חָקַר וַיַּעַמְד אַחֲרֵיהֶם תַּחֲתָם are also

associated in our sources with the unfortunate incident of the Golden Calf, the heroic death of the original group of seventy elders on account of their opposition to the making of this idol (cf Tanh. B. IV, p. 58; and the parallels cited by Buber ad loc.. See also the opposing notion that these elders perished on account of their own conduct, Tanh. B. IV, p. 60-61, and the parallels cited ad loc.).

106. Cf Mechilta Beshallah iv, 3, p. 49a; also Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai, p. 110.

107. This rendering is based on Jastrow, who gives the singular of אַפֶּסֶת as אַפֶּס. Consequently, we may presume that R. Tarphon based his Aggadah upon the expression מְחֻסָּה in Ex. 16:14, which he has rendered as אַפֶּס מְחֻסָּה, "covered by a palm". Löw, however, suggests that אַפֶּסֶת is a corruption for אֵימָקוֹפִים, "a threshold", which occurs in Sifre Num. 89, p. 246 (cf "Lexikalische Mizellen", "Festschrift zum Siebsigsten Geburtstag David Hoffmans", Berlin 1914, pp. 119-20). Although there is some external evidence for Löw's emendation (MSS of Midrash ha-Gadol quoted by Epstein in Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai, loc. cit., read אֵימָקוֹפִים = אַפֶּסֶת), it cannot be accepted without serious reservation. Firstly, this expression does not concur with Ex. 16:14, of which R. Tarphon's remarks

are intended to be an exegetical comment (although we do find the expression מחטט equated with חז'ס "a valise", or "bag" - cf R. Jose b. R. Hanina's statement in Yoma 75b, and compare the reading in MS Munich, also Rashi on Exodus loc. cit. - we can find no midrashic basis for associating איסקופים with מחטט). Moreover, the reading אופסים has some manuscript support which cannot be disregarded. MSS Oxford and Munich read אופסים (which suggests merely a metathesis for אופסים rather than a corruption איסקופים), this reading is also preserved in a fragment of the Mechilta from the Genizah (cf Ginzberg, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 17, note 101).

108. Our suggestion that R. Tarphon identified כפר in Job 33:24, with the patriarchs, is based on the exposition of this verse in the passage cited from Pesikta Rabbati above (p. 145f). It is conceivable that R. Tarphon found an allusion to the prayers of the patriarchs not only in the phrase והעל שבת הטל (as did his colleagues, R. Eleazar of Modi'in and R. Joshua, cf Mechilta loc. cit.), but also in the expression

דק ככפור , rendering Ex. 16:14 as, "Behold there was upon the face of the wilderness, Manna covered by the hand (of God, $\text{מחטה פס} = \text{מחטט}$), Manna according to כפר , the merit of the patriarchs".

109. Cf Tanh. B. IV, p. 137, and the parallels cited

by Buber ad loc.

110. Cf GR 52:5, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 544; also Tanh. B. I, p. 177.

111. Cf "דרשות חז"ל על נביאי אומות העולם ועל פרשת נלעם" Tarbitz XXV, 1955-56, p. 278f.

112. Cf Num. R. 20:12; also Tanh. B. IV, p. 137, also OV Balak 8, on the basis of which the above text has been emended.

113. So Tanh. B., loc. cit..

114. See Tanh. OV, loc. cit.; see also חדושי הרש"ש on Num. R. ad loc..

115. Cf Ex. R. 7:2, where only 33:29 is cited, however, the preceding verse is clearly presupposed by our unknown Aggadist. On Job 33:29, see further Yoma 86b; also Tosephta Yoma v (vi, ed. Zucker. p. 191).

116. On God's dividing the glory of the Divine spirit between Moses and Aaron, see note 90 above, on Job 37:5.

117. Cf p. 135f above, on Eliphaz' speech in chapter 4.

118. By which the true Israel could be distinguished

from false claimants, cf Ex. R. 47:1, and the parallels cited ad loc.; also Tanh. B. I, p. 88, and the parallels cited ad loc.; PT Pe'ah ii, 17a; Num. R. 14:10.

119. Cf the statement of Hananiah, the nephew of R. Joshua (PT Shekal. vi, 49d):

בין כל דבור ודבור

דיקדוקיה ואותיותיה של תורה, דכתיב „ממלאים בתרשיש”

(שה'ש ה' 14). In the parallel passage in Num. R. 13:16,

the reading is, שהיו כתובים בלוחות פרשיותיה ודיקדוקיה

של תורה. See further Cant. R. to 5:14; also Philo, "De Decalogo", 29, for the view that the Decalogue contains the kernel of the entire Torah.

120. Cf Ex. R. 46:1.

121. On the equation of תושיה with the Torah, cf PRE 3 (on Prov. 8:14): "בתורה ששמה „תושיה”, on the expression ויגד in the proof-text from Job, see below, p. 305, note 3.

122. Which presupposes that the Midrash has taken וישה as וישא. Alternatively, this expression may have been associated with נשה "to forget" (cf Deut. 32:18, צור ילדך תשי), hence, "He has made you forget your iniquity".

123. Cf Num. R. 19:26; Tanh. B. IV, pp. 7 and 128; OV, Hukkath, 21; 'Erubh. 54a; also the sources cited in the

next note. See also Ginzberg, op. cit. Vol. VI, p. 32, note 185.

124. Cf PK 12, p. 107a (ed. Mandel. p. 219); New Midrash on the Torah, Mann op. cit., p. 244.

125. Cf also PT RH i, 57a, where the well-known maxim is related to Job 8:6.

126. Cf Ex. R. 3:2; also Tanh. OV Shemoth 20.

127. Evidently the Midrash has taken מַמְלָכָה as a construct of מַמְלִיכָה. It is also possible that the expression has been taken as a direct allusion to idolatry on the basis of Hos. 12:12, אִם גִּלְעָד אֶוֶן אֶף שׁוֹא הָיוּ בְּגִלְגָּל מַשְׁמְרִים חֲבִלֵי שׁוֹא, also Jonah 2:9, שׁוֹרִים זִבְחוֹ.

128. On God's foreseeing the making of the Golden Calf, see Ex. R. 42:5, 43:8; Deut. R. 3:9.

129. Viz. QUADRIGA. The expression TETTRAMOULI, a hybrid word, is not recorded in Greek dictionaries, cf Jastrow p. 528, also Levy, Wörterbuch II, Nachträge, p. 209.

130. See further Ex. R. 43:8, also 30:7; according to Einhorn ad loc., we have an allusion to the above Aggadah in these sources. Some consideration must also be given to the account for the origin of the Golden Calf given in Midrash Shir ha-Shirim i (ed. Grünhut p. 13a-b), which does suggest some association with the Merkabah.

However, our source remains unique.

CHAPTER THREE: THE WORK OF CREATION

I. Introductory Comments

Unlike מעשה דור המבול which, as we observed above, was associated with the Book of Job already in tannaitic times,¹ no tradition has been preserved in our sources linking מעשה בראשית with this book. However, in the following pages, we will endeavour to show that the cosmogonic and mythological elements contained in the Book of Job, which early rabbinic tradition assigns to the author of the Pentateuch himself,² were quite naturally regarded by the Rabbis already at an early period as a supplement to the opening chapters of Genesis.³

Before proceeding to consider the relevant material, it is possible to make one or two observations regarding the prohibition imposed upon the public exposition of מעשה בראשית in Mishnah Hagigah 2:1. Presumably, this prohibition was intended to curb mystical speculation on the subject of the creation, which figures prominently in Gnostic and later Kabbalistic thought, but has left so few traces in early aggadic literature.⁴ It is to be noted, however, that there was some difference of opinion in talmudic times regarding the prohibited and permissible areas of

cosmogonic studies. From the abundant material preserved in our sources dealing with the technical aspects of the work of creation, the methods and materials employed by the Creator, it is clear that such topics were not regarded as falling within the limitations imposed by the Mishnah. The semi-Tanna, Bar Kappara, who inveighs in the strongest terms against those who dishonour God through their expositions on the subject of ⁵ מעשה בראשית, draws a clear distinction between the pre-creation period and the six days of the creation. Only the former period is forbidden to human inquiry, Bar Kappara asserts, but not the latter.⁶ In complete opposition to this view, the Amora, R. Hama b. Hanina deduced from Job 20:4, that human inquiry may begin only with the appearance of man upon the earth, thus excluding any exposition of the details and events of the first five days of the creation:-

" הוּא ידַע מִנִּי עַד "	" הוּא ידַע מִנִּי עַד "
means, 'The Torah knows what	הַתּוֹרָה יוֹדַעַת מַה
was before the creation of	קוֹדֶם לַבְרִיָּתוֹ שֶׁל
the world', ⁷ but you have no	עוֹלָם, אֲבָל אַתָּה
business to inquire save,	אֵין לְךָ עֵסֶק לִדְרוֹשׁ
מִנִּי שִׁים אָדָם עַל הָאָרֶץ	אֵלֹא מִנִּי שִׁים אָדָם
the time when man was placed	עַל הָאָרֶץ."
upon the earth!'" ⁸	

It is highly probable that R. Hama was aware of the danger presented by Gnostic cosmogonic speculation, the effects of which, he may have witnessed even in Jewish circles.⁹ Consequently, he sought to deter his listeners from any kind of inquiry, thereby averting its potential danger. However, the challenge presented by Gnostic assertions regarding the defects of the physical world and of its creator, could not remain unanswered. Regardless, therefore, of the potential danger in cosmogonic studies, or of the original implications of Mishnah Hagigah 2:1, public instruction in creation themes became an effective means of counter-propaganda, demonstrating the perfection of the Creator and the created, His power and purpose over the forces and elements of nature. In the passages discussed below, which form only a small part of the extensive material relating to rabbinic cosmogony preserved in our sources, we will endeavour to show how these notions emerge as a consistent theme.

II. The Primordial Light

Aggadic sources have preserved a number of traditions relating to the extraordinary qualities of the Primordial Light, its functions and its ultimate concealment, several of which have their origins in high antiquity. In the following passage, a number of

these aggadic elements are introduced in connection with verses from the Book of Job. Presupposing the well-known tradition of the concealment of the Primordial Light, an unknown Aggadist, on the basis of Job 37:3, describes how the light functioned once more on the eve of the first Sabbath. Taking up the theme of the light's concealment in connection with Job 38:15, R. Judah b. Pazzi comments also on the remarkable powers of perception which the Primordial Light allowed (cf GR

11:2, ed. T-A, p. 88): כיון ששקעה החמה בלילי שבת¹⁰ התחילה האורה והיתה משמשת, התחילו הכל מקלסין, הה' ד' התחת כל השמים ישרהו¹¹ - מפני מה? - "ואורו על כנפות הארץ". א'ר יהודה ב'ר סימון: אור שברא הקב'ה ביום ראשון אדם צופה ומביט בו מסוף העולם ועד סופו, כיון שהסתכל הקב'ה באנשי דור המבול ובאנשי דור הפלגה שמעשיהן מקולקלין, עמד וגנזה והתקינה לצדיקים לעתיד לבא, ומניין שגנזה? שנ' "וימנע מרשעים אורם".¹²

Altmann, who found certain difficulties in the second statement in this passage,¹³ regards the legends relating to the Primordial Light in talmudic-midrashic sources, as being taken from the context of the Adam legends, which were in turn influenced by Gnostic thought. While the parallels between the Primordial Light and the Primordial Man in our sources cannot be disputed,¹⁴ Altmann, in failing to consider non-rabbinic literature, did not observe that there were notions relating to the Primordial Light current in pre-Christian times, quite independent of the Adam

legends, which may have formed the basis of both rabbinic and Gnostic traditions.

Firstly, the exceptional qualities of the Primordial Light. This notion was known already to Philo, who declares that just as the sun is to the darkness, and day to night, so the Primordial Light surpasses any ordinary light. Moreover, for Philo, it was the light of reason, allowing a man extraordinary mental, rather than physical powers of perception, as suggested in rabbinic sources.¹⁵ Moreover, it may be possible to trace these notions back to an even earlier period. The Wisdom of Solomon, written a century before the beginning of the Christian era, associates the Everlasting Light with Wisdom, employing once again the imagery of its superiority over the physical luminaries.¹⁶

As to the functioning of the Primordial Light on the eve of the first Sabbath, to which our passage refers, we may note that this tradition also has its origins in high antiquity representing a fusion of two ideas, the Primordial Light and the Primordial Sabbath, which is found already in the second century BCE. Thus the Alexandrian Jewish writer, Aristobulus declared that the Sabbath day might "naturally be called the first birth of light, whereby all things are beheld".¹⁷

One further passage to be noted in this

context reflects a theme to which we will refer frequently in this chapter, God's authority and power over His creations. The need to stress Divine control over both light and darkness was understandably of special importance, as is indicated already in the Bible and in the daily liturgy.¹⁸ In the following homily based on Job 38:12, light and darkness are likened to two prefects or commanders, each assigned to his respective post by Divine command:¹⁹

א'ר ברכיה: כך דרשו שני גדולי עולם ר' יוחנן ור' שמעון בן לקיש, "ויבדל" אבדלה ממש.²⁰ למלך שהיו לו שני איסטרוטיגין,²¹ אחד שליט ביום ואחד שליט בלילה, והיו שניהן מדיינין זה עם זה, זה אומר "אני אשלוט ביום", וזה אומר "אני אשלוט ביום". קרא המלך לראשון ואמר לו, "פלוננו, יום יהא תחומך", ולשני אמר לו "פלונני, לילה יהא תחומך". כך "ויקרא אלקים לאור יום" - אמר לו "יום יהא תחומך" - "ולחשך קרא לילה" - אמר לו "לילה יהא תחומך". א'ר יוחנן: הוא שהקב"ה אומר לאיוב, "המימין צוית בקר" אתמהא? אלא "הידעת שחר מקומו" אתמהא? הודעתו²² אי זה הוא מקומו אתמהא?

III. The Primordial Waters

The conduct of the Primordial Waters at the time of the creation is a subject of special interest for our study of the aggadic interpretation of the Book of Job. Although written under the dominant influence of Israelite monotheism, the Book of Job is noted for its numerous allusions to ancient mythological traditions which have been greatly illuminated by the extensive remains of early Canaanite mythology preserved in the

23

Ugaritic texts of Ras Shamra. In the following pages, and in a subsequent chapter, we will endeavour to show that the mythological heritage of the Ancient Near-East is important as a background not only for the mythological elements in the Bible, but also for certain traditions preserved in the rabbinic exegesis of the relevant scriptural passages.^{23a}

As in the Accadian creation epic, the Ugaritic texts relate how the divine hero (Baal), in order to establish his dominion, is obliged to contend with the challenge presented by the genius of the sea (Yam), whom he ultimately subdues.²⁴ Because of its obvious poly-

theistic implications, biblical sources preserve only a number of passing allusions to this conflict-legend, as

in Job 26:12, בָּנָהוּ דָּגַע הַיָּם וּבְתוֹנוֹתָיו מִחַץ דָּהָב.²⁵ Rabbinic
not reconstructed

sources, on the other hand, have preserved the ancient myth in its more original form. In conjunction with the

above verse from Job, the early Amora, Rav, has

virtually reconstructed the early conflict-legend. God, the creator, seeks to establish the cosmic order.

Before He can accomplish this task, however, He is obliged to dispose of the unco-operative genius of the sea (יָם שֶׁל יָם), who refused to accommodate the primordial waters so that the work of creation might

proceed:²⁶ ואמר רב יהודה אמר רב: בשעה שבקש הקב"ה לבראות את העולם, אמר לו לשר של ים, "פתח פִּיךָ ובלע כל מימות

שבעולם", אמר לפניו "רבש"ע, די שאעמוד בשלי". מיד בעט בו
והרגו, שנאמר "ובסחר דגם הים ובתבונתו מחץ רהב". א"ר יצחק
ש"מ שרו של י. רהב שמו.

Ginzberg already recognised the parallel between Rav's Aggadah and the Babylonian creation epic, and suggested that the Babylonian Talmud is the source for this Aggadah in Palestinian Midrashim.²⁷ Ginzberg, however, was unaware of the Ugaritic version of the primordial conflict which, together with the biblical allusions to this early legend, clearly indicate that the conflict with the sea formed part of the mythological heritage of Palestine, centuries before Rav. Moreover, on closer examination, it can be shown that Palestinian sources have preserved a fuller version of the ancient myth than that recorded in the Babylonian Talmud. The Accadian creation epic relates how Marduk, having vanquished Tiamat, tramples on her carcass, from which he creates the primeval seas, which are barred and guarded to keep them in check.²⁸ Scattered allusions to these cosmogonic events are preserved in biblical writings, notably Job 9:8, which describes God as the sole creator of the heavens, who tramples upon the body of Yam,²⁹ and 38:8ff, which records the conception, birth and ultimate incarceration of the primordial sea. From Palestinian Midrashim it is clear that the early myth presupposed by the biblical text, was known among the

rabbinic scholars. This is evident in the following passage where the early myth is reproduced in connection with the relevant scriptural verses. God slays the unco-operative genius of the sea, tramples upon the primordial waters, securing them behind bars and doors: ³⁰

... כשברא הקב"ה את עולמו אמר לו לשר של ים: פתח פִּיךָ ובלע כל מימות בראשית. אמר לפניו: רבש"ע, ד"י שאעמוד בשלי. התחיל לבכות, בעט בו והרגו שנאמר "בכחו רגע הים ובתבונתו מחץ דהב" וגו'..... מה עשה הקב"ה? כבשן ודרכן וקבלן הים. שנאמר "ודורך על במתי ים"³¹, ושם להם חול בריח ודלתים שנאמר "ויסך בדלתים ים (... ואשבר עליו חקי ואשים בריח ודלתים: השחה מהרו'ו שם)", וכתוב "האזתי לא תיראו נאם ה'.... אשר שמתי חול גבול לים (ירמ' ה' 22)", וכתוב "ואמר עד פה תבא ולא תוסיף (איוב שם)".

By way of contrast with the preceding material, we may note one further passage reflecting a different cycle of legends, ascribing to the primordial waters a favourable rather than a rebellious role, which may

*I also
know that
- Job
- 23:13*

represent a reaction against the early mythological picture, as Ginzberg suggests. ³² According to an unknown Aggadist, it was the waters which actually inspired God to undertake the work of creation, as is suggested by Job 23:13: ³³ ומקול שבחן של מים רבים נתן הקב"ה את דעתו לבדא את העולם ואחר כך בדברו ברא את העולם שנאמר "כי הוא אמר ויהי הוא צוה ויעמד (תה' ל'ג, 9)", ואומר "והוא באחד ומי ישיבנו ונפשו אותה ויעש".

IV. The Creation of the World

A number of traditions and notions relating to the creation of the world have been associated with verses from the Book of Job in talmudic-midrashic literature. Two verses in particular were employed by both Tannaim and Amoraim as the scriptural basis for cosmogonic theories, 37:6, כִּי לִשְׁלֵג יֵאמֶר הוּא אֲרֶץ וְגֶשֶׁם, בִּצְקַת עֹפֶר לְמוֹצָק וְרִגְבִּים, and 38:38, מִטֶּר וְגֶשֶׁם מִטְרוֹת עִזּוּ יִדְבְּקוּ. The two early Tannaim, R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos and R. Joshua b. Hananiah, in their discussion regarding the initial stages of the world's construction, based their opposing notions on these two verses:³⁴ ר' אליעזר אומר: עולם מאמצעיתו נברא, שנאמר, "בצקת עפר למוצק ורגבים ידבקו". ר' יהושע אומר: עולם מן הצדדין נברא, שנאמר, "כי לשלג יאמר הוא ארץ וגשם מטר וגו'". ("R. Eliezer said: The world was created from its centre outwards, as it is said, 'When the dust was laid as a central foundation, and the clods cleaved together.'³⁵ R. Joshua said: The world was created from its sides inwards, as it is said, 'For He said to the snow: Be thou earth!'.")³⁶

Although their comments in this passage deal specifically with the manner in which the world was created, we may infer from their respective proof-texts that R. Eliezer regarded dust as the primordial element, while R. Joshua considered snow to be the basic component in the earth's formation. However, no

statement by either of these scholars on this subject has been preserved. In later sources, however, it is in connection with these two notions regarding the primordial element of the world, that Job 37:6 and 38:38 are found. The notion that the world was created from snow, an extension of the early mythological view that water was the primordial element,³⁷ was regarded by the Amora R. Judah b. R. Simon as a piece of information purposely concealed by God at the time of the creation, only to be revealed in Job 37:6:³⁸ מתחלת ברייתו של עולם
 "גלי עמיקתא ומסתרתא",³⁹ "בראשית ברא אלקים.... ואת הארץ -
 ולא פירש, והיכן פירש? להלן, "כי לשלג יאמר הוא ארץ....".

The alternative notion that the basic element of the world was primordial dust, was associated with Job 38:38 already in tannaitic times. Being unable to answer the query of Abnimos of Gadera⁴⁰ regarding the creation of the world, the scholars directed him to Abba Joseph the builder, who propounded the following view:⁴¹
 נטל הקב"ה עפר מהחם כסא הכבוד וזרק על המים ונעשה ארץ, וצדורות קטנים שהיו בעפר נעשו הרים וגבעות, שנאמר
 "God took dust from" ("בצקת עפר למוצק ורגבים ידבקו".
 beneath the Throne of Glory, sprinkled it upon the face of the waters, and the earth was formed, the small gravel among the dust forming the mountains and the hills, as it is said, 'When the dust was poured out to form a mass,⁴² and the gravel cleaved to it.'").

A further notion regarding the initial act of creation is to be found in a further tannaitic source, once again in association with a verse from the Book of Job. As Feuchtwang⁴³ has noted in connection with the אבן, the foundation stone in popular legend, from which the world was formed,⁴⁴ that there is a wider complex of ideas to which this Aggadah belongs, regarding primordial stones sunk into the deep, acting as a dam against the waters which threaten to engulf the world. This notion underlies the following Aggadah in the name of Isaac Nappaḥa⁴⁵ who, on the basis of Job 38:6, describes the foundation of the world as the result of a stone cast by God into the waters of the deep: אבן ירה הקב"ה בים ממנו נסתת העולם, שנאמר "על מה אדניה הטבעו, או מי ירה אבן פנתה?"⁴⁶

The final passage to be quoted in this section reflects the theme of God's power over His creations, and His ability to impose limitations upon them. The interpretation of שדי as "די" ⁴⁷is well known and occurs frequently in our sources. Less common, however, is the notion that God rebuked His world when it attempted to exceed its limitations.⁴⁸ In the following passage, Rav found an allusion to this notion in Job 26:11:⁴⁹ בשעה שברא הקב"ה את העולם היה מרחיב והולך כשתי פקעיות של שתי עד שגער בו הקדוש ברוך הוא והעמידו, שנאמר "עמודי שמים ירופפו ויתמחו מגערתו".

("When God created His world, it extended further and

72
See
also
p. 202

further, like two unwound clues of thread, until God rebuked it and brought it to a halt, as it is said, 'The pillars of the heavens were loosed, but at His rebuke, they stood still.'").⁵⁰

It is possible that this notion may have some further significance. That the heavens and the earth are subject to the will of God, and not independent creative entities, was stressed by R. Akiba in his exposition of Genesis 1:1.⁵¹ According to Marmorstein, this indicates that R. Akiba was familiar with the theories of the early Greek philosophical schools,⁵² where the heavens and earth figure as deities active in the work of creation. It may not be necessary, however, to seek the object of R. Akiba's remarks in early Greek thought. More recent evidence indicates the existence of heretical, or philosophical schools in Jewish Palestine itself, among whom such notions may have been current, and whose teachings may have provoked a reaction within rabbinic circles.⁵³

V. The Heavens and the Firmament

The two passages to be considered in this section reflect a compromise effected by the Babylonian scholar, Rav, to solve a problem arising from the early verses of Genesis relating to the creation of the heavens.

From Genesis 1:1, we may infer that the heavens were created on the first day, a view upheld by the School of Shammai.⁵⁴ However, identification of the firmament with the heavens in verse 8, suggests that the heavens were created on the second day, which was the opinion adopted by the School of Hillel.⁵⁵ In order to eliminate this difficulty, Rav suggested that the process of the heavens' formation extended over two days. On the second day, God formed the firmament by hardening or congealing the still moist heavens created on the first day⁵⁶ (רב אמר: לחים היו השמים ביום הראשון ובשני קרשו, "יהי רקיע", יחזק רקיע!⁵⁸)

As to the means by which this process of hardening or congealing was achieved, R. Ḥanina, Rav's contemporary, suggested that the surface of the firmament was glazed by a celestial fire, a notion for which R. Johanan b. Nappaha found a basis in Job 26:13:⁵⁹ אמר ר' חנינא: יצאה האש מלמעלה ולחכה את פני הרקיע. ר' יוחנן, כשהיה מגיע לפסוק זה, "ברוחו שמים שפרה", היה אומר: יפה R. Ḥanina said: A flame issued forth from above and dried up the surface of the firmament. R. Johanan, when he would come upon the verse,⁶⁰ 'With His breath He smoothed the heavens', he would say: R. Ḥanina has taught me well!".).

Expounding a further verse from this same chapter, R. Johanan's pupil, R. Isaac, introduces the

notion of God's authority over His creations, imposing His will upon them by means of גערה, "Divine Rebuke".

R. Isaac compares the solidifying of the heavens to the congealing of milk through the addition of rennet. After

their creation on the first day, the heavens trembled

like liquid, until God's rebuke congealed them: ⁶¹ר' יצחק:

אמר: שמים - שא מים, טעון מים. משל לחלב שהיה נתון בקערה,

עד שלא תרד לתוכו טיפה אחת של מסו, הוא מרפרף, כיון שתרד

לתוכו טיפה אחת של מסו מיד הוא קופא ועומד. כך "עמודי

השמים ירופפו ויתמהו מגערתו", ניתן בהם המסו עמדו השמים,

"ויאמר אלקים - ביום השני - יהי רקיע". אתיא כדאמר רב,

..... ("R. Isaac said: שמים stands for

מים - viz. 'carry water!'. It may be compared to milk

in a bowl, before a drop of rennet is put into it, it ⁶²

quivers. As soon as a drop of rennet is put into it, it

solidifies and stands still. Similarly, 'The pillars of

the heavens were quivering, but at His rebuke they stood

still.' ⁶³ Thus, once the rennet was put into them, the

heavens stood fast. Hence it is written, 'And God said - ⁶⁴

on the second day - Let there be a firmament! (Gen. 1:6)' ⁶⁵

This accords with the view expressed by Rav etc. ...").

VI. The Creation and the Fall of Man

A number of traditions relating to the First Man have been associated with verses from the Book of Job. Several passages quoted below reflect once again the theme of God's supremacy over His creations and His

power to impose limitations upon them, which, in connection with the Adam-figure, assumes a special significance. The considerable prominence allotted to Adam in Gnostic thought, which may have permeated into Jewish heretical circles,⁶⁶ provoked a strong response from the Rabbis who, while preserving traditions relating to the splendour of Adam as the creation of God's own hands, dwell consistently upon the theme of Adam's loss of his immortal and superhuman attributes as a result of his sin.

Before proceeding to present the relevant material, some consideration is to be given to a specific passage which reflects philosophical notions which may have been current in Palestine long before the emergence of heretical movements in the talmudic period. In connection with Job 7:9, an anonymous teacher asserts that God created the First Man without any reference to a celestial prototype, a view which suggests some opposition to Platonic theories. Although this homily is preserved only in Recanati's commentary to the Pentateuch, its style and language suggest that it has been

⁶⁷
taken from an earlier midrashic source: אמר הקב"ה לאיוב:

"כלה ענן וילך", אם ילך אדם לפני צ"ר ויאמר לו "עשה לי צורתו של אבא", מה הצ"ר אומר? "הראני איקונין שלו ואם לאו לא אוכל לעשותו". ואני בראתי אדם הראשון שלא באיקונין, על

אחת כמה וכמה המיתים שכל אחד ואחד זיו איקונין שלהם
לפני?" ("God said to Job: 'As a cloud is

consumed and vanishes, so he that goes down to the grave shall come up no more'.⁶⁸ If a man were to go to an artist and say, 'Make me an image of father!', what would the artist say? 'Show me a likeness of him, otherwise I cannot make it!'. Yet I created the First Man without any likeness, how much more so will I be able to refashion the dead of whom the likeness of every one is before Me?!").).

Job 25:2, המשל ופחד עמו עושה שלום במרומו',
occurs widely in our sources in connection with the notion of cosmic peace.⁶⁹ This verse occurs in the following homily where the creation of Adam is presented as a compromise between the celestial and terrestrial elements in order to preserve the peace of the universe. This notion has an interesting parallel in the Gnostic concept of the creation of Primeval Man to preserve the peace of the worlds of light.⁷⁰ However, the suggestion that the First Man is a combination of both heavenly and earthly elements, may be a refutation of a further Gnostic idea that Adam was created without the taint of the admixture of the lower world.⁷¹ "All that we behold derives either from the heavens or from the earth!", declares R. Shimon b. Ḥalaphta, who continues to demonstrate the balance achieved during the six days of the creation between the products of the celestial and terrestrial regions, until God came to the creation of man:⁷² אמר, "אם אני בורא אותו"

מִן הַעֲלִיּוֹנִים, עָכְשִׁי הַעֲלִיּוֹנִים רַבִּים עַל הַתַּחְתּוֹנִים בְּרִיָּה אַחַת,
וְאִין שְׁלוֹם בְּעוֹלָם, וְאִם אֲנִי בּוֹרֵא אוֹתוֹ מִן הַתַּחְתּוֹנִים, עָכְשִׁי
הַתַּחְתּוֹנִים רַבִּים עַל הַעֲלִיּוֹנִים בְּרִיָּה אַחַת וְאִין שְׁלוֹם בְּעוֹלָם.
אַלֹּא הֲרִי אֲנִי בּוֹרֵא אוֹתוֹ מִן הַעֲלִיּוֹנִים וּמִן הַתַּחְתּוֹנִים בְּשִׁבִּיל
שְׁלוֹם דָּא'ר שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ, "הַמֶּשֶׁל וּפְחַד עִמּוֹ עוֹשֶׂה
שְׁלוֹם בְּמִרוֹמָיו." ("He said: If I create him from
the celestial regions, then the celestial regions will
out-number the terrestrial regions, and there will be no
peace in the universe! Yet, if I create him from the
terrestrial regions, then the terrestrial regions will
out-number the celestial regions. Therefore, I will
create man from both celestial and terrestrial elements
that there may be peace as Resh Lakish said,
'Dominion and fear are with Him; He maketh peace in His
high places.'").⁷³

The association between Adam and celestial
peace in connection with Job 25:2, can be traced back
to tannaitic times. The following passage reflects a
tradition which occurs widely in our sources, the
opposition of the angels to the creation of man,⁷⁴ a notion
for which Altmann finds certain parallels in Gnostic
thought.⁷⁵ Had God not protected Adam and brought peace
among the celestial beings, they would have incinerated
him:⁷⁶ "אַחֲזֹר וְקָדַם צִרְתָּנִי וְחָשָׂה עָלַי כַּפֶּךָ": מִלְּמַד כְּשִׁבְרָא הַקָּב"ה
אֵת אָדָם, בִּקְשׁוֹ מִלֹּאכֵי הַשָּׁרָה לְהַבְהִיבּוֹ, וּפְרַשׁ הַמָּקוֹם כִּפּוֹ עָלָיו
וְשָׁמְרוּ, וְהִטִּיל שְׁלוֹם בֵּינֵיהֶם, שְׁנֹאמַר "הַמֶּשֶׁל וּפְחַד עִמּוֹ עוֹשֶׂה
שְׁלוֹם בְּמִרוֹמָיו." ("Behind and before You did guard me,"⁷⁷ and
set Your hand over me (Psalms 139:5)': This teaches that

when God created Adam, the ministering angels sought to burn him up!⁷⁸ But God spread His hand over him, protecting him, and brought peace among them, as it is said, *הַמַּשְׁלֵי וּפָחַד עִמּוֹ*, which means, 'Gabriel and Michael strove with Him' - yet, *יוֹשֵׁה שְׁלוֹם בְּמִרוֹמָיו*, 'He makes peace etc...').⁷⁹

Turning to the fall of Adam and the effects of his sin on his descendants, the following material represents only a few aspects of the traditions and notions contained in our sources. A full discussion on the place of Original Sin in Jewish thought is beyond the scope of this study. We may note, however, that a scholarly analysis of the relevant material in biblical, apocryphal and rabbinic sources, has shown that this concept, which figures so prominently in Christian - particularly Pauline - theology, has its origins in very early Jewish teachings.⁸⁰ Two such early notions relating to Adam before and after his fall, have been preserved in the following homily based on Job 14:20, *חֲקִפְהוּ לִנְצַח*. The pre-Christian "Wisdom of Solomon" expresses the idea that Adam was created to be immortal, death was brought into the world only through the intervention of the Serpent or Devil.⁸¹ An even earlier source, Ben Sirah, speaks of the strength with which God had invested Adam.⁸² Both these notions have been combined in the following Aggadah. Adam was imbued with an eternal strength, but he forfeited the gift of immortality

83

through following the will of the Serpent: ר' סימון כחה
 "תקפהו לנצח ויהלוק משנה פניו ותשלחהו", חוקף שנתן הקב"ה
 לאדם הראשון - "לנצח" - לעולם היה, "ויהלוק" - כיון שהניח
 דעתו של הקדוש ברוך הוא והלך אחר דעתו של נחש - "משנה
 פניו ותשלחהו". ("R. Simon opened with the

following proemial verse: תתקפהו לנצח ויהלוק משנה פניו

84 means that the strength which God bestowed
 upon Adam originally, לנצח, was to be forever, ויהלוק,
 but as soon as he forsook the will of God and went after
 the will of the Serpent, ותשלחהו פניו, You changed
 his countenance and sent him away!").

The second clause of Job 14:20, משנה פניו

is found widely in our sources in association
 with a further tradition regarding the consequences of
 Adam's sin. We referred earlier, in connection with the
 Primordial Light,⁸⁵ to the lustre or splendour of Adam's
 countenance. According to R. Ammi,⁸⁶ Adam lost his
 splendour immediately. The Rabbis, however, maintained
 that for the duration of the first Sabbath, Adam retained
 his glory: ומוצאי שבת נטל ממנו זיוו וסדרו מן עדן, הה' ד⁸⁷
 88. "משנה פניו ותשלחהו".

Another well-known tradition, occurring
 frequently in our sources, which has been associated with

a verse from Job, is the notion that Adam was created as
 a Microcosmos,⁸⁹ filling the entire world, until he sinned
 and was reduced in his proportions. It is possible that
 this Aggadah was actually incorporated into an early

Targum to Job as can be seen from the following passage: ⁹⁰

„אם יעלה שמים שיאו" - רומיה - „וראשו לעב יגיע" - עד מט' ענניא! א'ר יהושע בר' חנינא בר' יהודה בר' סימון בשם ר' אלעזר: מלא כל העולם כולו בראו וגו'.. „כגללו לנצח יאבד", על שגלל מצוה קלה נטרד מגן עדן. „רואיו יאמרו איו?" - ⁹²הן האדם? כיון שטרדו התחיל מקונן עליו ואומר, „הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו (ברא' ג' 22) - הוה כאחד ממנו.

(„אם יעלה שמים שיאו" which means, 'Even though his height may go up to the heavens', „וראשו לעב יגיע", 'and his head reach unto the clouds'. R. Joshua b. R. Hanina and R. Judah b. R. Simon said in the name of R. Eleazar: God created Adam so that he filled the entire universe.... (verse 7), 'but because he discarded a slight precept, he was bannished from the Garden of Eden!' „רואיו יאמרו איו", 'Those who have seen him say: Where is he?', 'Where is Adam?'. Once God had bannished him, He began to mourn for him saying, „הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו? (93). 'Where is man who was like one of us?'.⁹³

With regard to the effect of Adam's sin on his descendants, there is some divergency on this matter already in apocryphal sources, as Cohon has observed.⁹⁴ It is generally agreed that death is part of Adam's heritage to every man, however, to what extent is he responsible for the fate of each individual, and how far is this fate unavoidable? A particularly pessimistic outlook, approaching the Pauline view, was adopted by the author of IV Esdras.⁹⁵ Adam's downfall is shared by his

descendants, and not even the Torah, despite its perfection, can redeem sinners. The more acceptable view in terms of rabbinic thought, is expressed in II Baruch.⁹⁶

Adam is responsible only for the death of his progeny, but the fate of each man rests in his own hands. He alone prepares his own heaven or hell, the Torah being the means by which evil may be conquered.⁹⁷ In the following passage, this distinction between Adam's responsibility on the one hand, and the part played by each individual in deciding his own fate, is reflected in the

interpretation of Job 37:7:⁹⁸ "ביד כל אדם יחתום", מהו? אלא כשברא הקדוש ברוך הוא את האדם העביר לפניו כל הדורות עד שיחיו המתים, הצדיקים והרשעים. א'ל: ראה על מה הבאת מיתה, על הצדיקים. כיון ששמע אדם כך התחיל מיצר, אמר לפניו: רבוננו של עולם, וכך עשיתי בעולמך? אי איכפת לי על הרשעים שהן מתים, אלא על הצדיקים שלא יהו מתרעמין עלי, אלא בבקשה ממך שלא תכתוב עלי שאני הבאתי מיתה עליהם. א'ל הקב'ה: כך אני עושה, כיון שבא אדם ליפטר מן העולם, נגלה עליו הקב'ה, א'ל "כתוב מעשיך שעשית", והוא כותב. כיון שכתב אומר לו "חתום", והוא חותם, שנ' "ביד כל אדם יחתום".

(What does this mean? When God created Adam, He paraded before him all the future generations up to the time when the dead will be revived, both the righteous and the wicked. He said to him, 'See upon whom you have brought death, the righteous!'. When Adam heard this, he began to feel sorry.

He said to God, 'Lord of the Universe, I did this in Your world?! I am not concerned about the wicked who are to die, but about the righteous that they should not grumble against me, therefore, I appeal to You not to write concerning me that I brought death upon them!'. God said to him, 'This will I do. When the time comes for a man to depart from this world, God will reveal Himself to him and say, "Write down the deeds which you have wrought, for it is on account of them that you die!". He will write them down, and having done this, I will say to him, "Seal it!", and he will seal it, as it is said, "Every man will seal it with his own hand".')⁹⁹

Notes

1. See above, p. 20.
2. See above, p. 21.
3. One early tradition which we may note in this context, although its implications are open to question, is preserved in a non-rabbinic source. The pre-Christian Testament of Job attributes to its hero the knowledge of certain "mysteries" (cf 8:19f, ed. Brock, 38:1, p. 47), which may, as Kohler suggests (op. cit., p. 266), presuppose some very early association between the Book of Job and the subject of מעשה בראשית.
4. Cf G. Scholem, "Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism", p. 73f, where he cites two examples of speculative Aggadoth.
5. Cf GR 1:5, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 2: "הדוברות על צדיק עתק (תה' ל'ז 7) על צדיק חי עולמים דברים שהעתיק מבריותיו, "בגאווה" אתמהא? בשביל להתגאות ולומר "אני דורש במעשה בראשית"..." דאמר ר' יוסי ב'ר חנינא: כל המתכבד בקלון חברו אין לו חלק לעוה"ב, בכבוד הקב"ה על אחת כמה וכמה אתמהא? (השחה תיאודור, שם).
6. Cf GR 1:10, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 8f. In PT Hag. ii, 77c, Deut. 4:32 is subjected to a similar exposition by R. Jonah in the name of R. Aba. Einhorn, in his longer commentary to GR 1:10,

endeavours to prove that this statement is identical in meaning with that of Bar Kappara, and suggests that the text of the Yerushalmi be emended accordingly to read

בר קפרא. However, see Theodor loc. cit.. We may note further that Bar Kappara's view was accepted by R. Judah b. Pazzi and R. Levi (see below note 8).

7. Presumably, R. Hama has taken ידעת (lit. "knowest thou not etc. ..."), as a present participle ידעת. For the equation of זאת with תורה, cf AZ 2b: "מי בכם יגיד: 'מ' זאת, ואין זאת אלא תורה, שנאמר 'וזאת התורה וגו'.....". (see also Menah. 53b).

8. Cf GR 8:2 (ed. T-A, p. 37). In GR 9:1 (p. 67f), R. Levi quotes a further statement of R. Hama b. Hanina which indicates further his attitude towards the exposition of the opening chapters of Genesis: "וירא אלקים את כל אשר עשה (והנה טוב מאד", ברא' א' 31): 'ר' לוי [בשם ר' ח בר חנינא] פתח "כבוד אלקים חסתר דבר (מש' כ' ה 2)" ... מתחילת הספר ועד כאן כבוד אלקים הוא חסתר דבר, מכאן ואילך "כבוד מלכים חקור דבר (שם)" - כבוד ד'ה שנמשלו במלכים..... לחקור דבר. In PT Hagigah loc. cit., R. Hama's statement quoted above from GR 8:2, appears in the name of R. Levi. This reading is untenable, as can be seen from the Yerushalmi itself where this statement is juxtaposed to a further interpretation of Prov. 25:2, which clearly indicates that R. Levi drew the same distinction as Bar Kappara between the forbidden and permissible areas of human inquiry: "כבוד אלקים חסתר דבר" - עד שלא נברא העולם,

„וכבוד מלכים הקוד דבר" - משנברא העולם R. Levi's attitude towards the exposition of the work of creation is indicated further by his statement reported by R. Jonah in GR 1:10 (p. 8), and by his own expositions on this subject, see, for example, GR 4:7, 5:1, 3 and 4, 8:7 (pp. 31, 32, 34 and 61). We would suggest, therefore, that the text of the Yerushalmi be emended to read either, 'אמר ר' חמא בר חנינא (as is suggested by Einhorn in his longer commentary to GR 1:10), or possibly, 'אמר ר' לוי בשם ר' חמא בר חנינא (compare GR 9:1).

9. Cf "The Jung Codex and its Significance", trans. F.L. Cross, p. 62 (particularly the passage cited from "The Treatise on the Three Natures").

10. This is the reading of the early printed editions, also Yalkut Makiri. In the parallel passage in GR 12:6 (ed. T-A, p. 103), this reading is found also in MSS Oxford, Munich, and early printed editions. It is supported further by the parallel expression in GR ad loc.: ההחיל החשך משמש (ed. T-A, pp. 89 and 103). As to the reading in MSS London and Paris, הנהיגה (see also PR 23, p. 118b), this cannot be rendered to give any satisfactory sense.

11. Lit. "He sendeth it forth under the whole heavens". The expression 'שמהו has been associated midrashically with שירה. Printed editions continue with the second

clause of the verse, which, as the sense demands, has been omitted (cf Theodor loc. cit.).

12. Job 38:15; lit. "But from the wicked their light is withholden". On the concealment of the Primordial Light for the righteous in the hereafter, see the anonymous Baraita in GR 3:6, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 21.

13. Cf "Gnostic Themes in Rabbinic Cosmology", in "Essays Presented to J.H. Hertz", p. 28ff. Altmann stresses the reading $\eta\alpha\lambda\omega\gamma\alpha\varsigma$, which, he claims, is found in a manuscript cited by Theodor, thereby creating a difficulty how Adam, created on the sixth day, could have been in possession of the Primordial Light created on the first! We may note initially that no such manuscript exists. As Theodor himself stresses (p. 88, note to line 4), this whole Aggadah is without manuscript support. Altmann has evidently mistaken Theodor's quotation from the early Venice editions, where this Aggadah is found in both 11:2 and 12:6, as manuscript evidence. As to the reading $\eta\alpha\lambda\omega\gamma\alpha\varsigma$, which occurs only in these early printed editions, it is supported only by PT Berakh. viii, 12b, while the reading $\alpha\lambda\omega\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ is supported by all the following sources: PR 23, p. 118a; Ex. R. 35:1; Num. R. 13:5; Ruth R. Petihta, 6; Hag. 12a (both the Baraita in the name of R. Jacob, and the

statement in the name of R. Eleazar b. Pedath), also Yalkut Job 924. From these sources we may safely assume that the original reading was $\alpha\chi$. It is conceivable, however, that as the text in Genesis Rabbah makes frequent reference to $\alpha\chi\eta\gamma\omega\iota$, this reading was erroneously introduced into the Aggadah quoted above.

14. Both Adam's countenance and the Primordial Light are associated with the Sabbath; similarly, both could eclipse the light of the sun; cf GR loc. cit., also 3:6, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 21f; also Lev. R. 20:2, and Tanh. OV, 'Ahare' 2.

15. See the sources cited by Y. Baer, "ישראל בעמים", Jerusalem 1955, p. 86.

16. Cf chapter 7 end.

17. Cf R. Wilson, "The Gnostic Problem", London 1958, p. 38. Aristobulus' notion represents a combination of two quite independent concepts, the pre-cosmic light and the pre-cosmic Sabbath, a notion which was known also to Philo (cf Moses ii, 33; also Jubilees 2:30).

18. Cf Is. 45:7; Dan. 2:22; also the daily benediction based on Isaiah's utterance: $\text{יוצר אור ובורא חשך עושה שלום ובורא את הכל}$.

19. Cf GR 3:6, and Theodor ad loc., p. 22-23, for

parallels.

20. Cf Gen. 1:4. See also the opposing view in GR loc. cit., that the expression לַבֹּקֶר infers that God set the light aside, either for Himself, or for the righteous in the hereafter.

21. STRATEGOS, "commander", or "prefect".

22. So MSS London and Oxford 1; printed editions read הִידְעָה .

23. A detailed analysis of the mythological material contained in the Book of Job in the light of Ugaritic and other ancient mythology, has been incorporated into the commentaries of N.H. Tur-Sinai ("The Book of Job: A New Commentary", Jerusalem 1957), and particularly of M.H. Pope ("Job", the Anchor Bible, New York 1965).

23a. It is difficult to determine the means by which the ancient traditions relating both to the conflict with the sea, and to the slaying or subjugation of the dragon, discussed below (p. 287ff), became known to the Rabbis. It is conceivable that elements and details of these ancient myths survived in an oral form as part of the folk-lore of Palestine, known to both its Jewish and pagan inhabitants. However, we cannot discount the possibility of a literary source for these traditions in rabbinic circles. Possibly the Rabbis were familiar with

variant texts of the relevant biblical books which preserved more detailed allusions to the ancient conflict myth than those which are found in the massoretic text. Alternatively, ancient mythological traditions may have been incorporated into lost aggadic compilations (see below, p. 276), which, by the very nature of their contents were not widely disseminated, and therefore, have not survived.

24. Cf Gaster's translation of the relevant passages, "Thespis", p. 153ff.

25. For further biblical allusions to the primordial conflict, see Gaster op. cit., p. 142ff.

26. The notion that the Primordial Waters were consigned to the genius of the sea may be reflected already in a tannaitic source. In a discussion with his colleague R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, on the problem of the accommodating of the waters of the creation, R. Joshua suggests that they were consigned to דוכסא ים, "the Commander of the Sea" (viz. דוכסא = DUX; cf GR 5:3, and particularly the readings of MSS Vatican and Oxford 2, cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 34): ר' יהושע בן חנניה אמר: לדוכסא ים, לדוכסא ים. ר' אליעזר אומר: קלטם הים, המד'א (איוב ל'ח 16) הבאת ים. As to the view expressed here by R. Eliezer, in conjunction with an ancient Targum to Job 38:16, this may presuppose a notion found in later

sources, that the Primordial Waters were accommodated in the primeval ocean (see below, note 31). It is possible that this notion is an echo of the ancient myth where the defeated Yam is driven by 'Anat, female supporter of Baal, into the primordial sea (cf Gaster op. cit., p. 175). We may note further that the proof-text from Job with which R. Eliezer has associated his view, actually echoes the Ugaritic epic. The obscure expression נִבְךְ (= מִבְךְ, as in יָם מִבְכִּי, Job 28:11) has its parallel in Ugaritic texts (אל מִבְךְ נִהַרֵם; see Tur-Sinai op. cit., p. 181-2).

A further interpretation of this same verse from Job with reference to the Primordial Waters is found in a source which Scholem classifies among the Hekhaloth Books, "The Visions of Ezekiel" (cf Battei Midrashoth, 2nd ed., II, p. 128; also Scholem, "Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition", p. 5). Early in the tannaitic period, the Primordial Waters figure in Jewish cosmogonic speculation. One source (GR 2:4, ed. T-A, p. 17, for parallels) relates how R. Joshua b. Ḥananiah found Ben Zoma meditating on מַעֲשֵׂה בְרֵאשִׁית with reference to the division between the upper and the lower waters. In the following passage, we are informed that the arrangement of the waters in the Great Sea, was one of the visions revealed to Ezekiel: אָרְ יִצְחָק: הִרְאָהוּ: הַקֹּב'ה לִיחֻקָּאֵל מִימֵי בְרֵאשִׁית חֲבוּשִׁין בֵּיט הַגְּדוֹל וּבִנְדֻבְכִין, שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר: "R. Isaac said: God showed Ezekiel

the waters of the creation imprisoned in the Great Sea in rows, as it is said, 'Have you come unto נבכי ים - the rows of the sea?'. R. Isaac's allusion to the imprisonment of the Primordial Waters in the Great Sea, may, once again, reflect the early tradition of the opposition of the Primordial Waters. A clearer echo of the ancient conflict-myth is found in the following passage, based on Job 38:16, where the expression נבכי is associated with בכה, thus alluding to the weeping of the waters at being smitten by God: כשהרג אותו (השחה) חרושי הרש'ש שם) יש אומרים שהן בוכין עד היום, שנאמר, הבהאת. (cf Ex. R. 15:22; for a similar exposition of the expression מבכי, in Job 28:11, see GR 5:4, ed. T-A, p. 34-5: לא פירשו המים התחתונים מן העליונים אלא בבכיה, הה'ד, מבכי נהרות חבש").

27. Cf "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 26, note 73.

28. See the material cited by Pope op. cit., pp. 69 and 251.

29. נמה על במתי ים ; ודורך על במתי ים . 29 . "body", cf Tur-Sinai op. cit., p. 157-8.

30. Cf Num. R. 18:22; also Tanh. B. IV, p. 97-8.

31. All sources at this point read, דורך על במתי ארץ (Amos 4:3). However, the above emendation, clearly required by the sense of the passage, is already suggested by Luria (Num. R. ad loc.). Moreover, this emendation is

supported further by the version of this Aggadah in GR 5:2 (ed. T-A, p. 33), where God's trampling upon the waters is based upon Job 9:8: כל העולם כלו מים במים, ואתה אומר "אל מקום אחד" אתמהא? משל לעשר נודות נפוחות מונחות בטרקלין, נצרך המלך למקומן, מה הוא עושה להן? מתירן ומוציא את רוחן ומסלקן בזוית אחד. כך דרך הקב"ה על מי בראשית וסילקן בים אוקיינוס, הה"ד "הן יעצור במים ויבשו וגו' (איוב י"ב 15)", "ודורך על במתי ים (שם, ט' 8)".

("All the world consisted of water upon water, and you say, 'Let the waters be gathered to one place (Gen. 1:9)'! It may be compared to ten inflated skin bottles lying in a chamber, when the king requires the space they occupy, what does he do to them? He unties them, letting out the air in them, and piles them in a corner. Thus God trod upon the Primordial Waters, and relegated them to the Primordial Ocean, as it is written, 'Behold, He compresses the waters so that they dry up', and it is written, 'and He trod upon the body of the sea.'").

32. Loc. cit..

33. Midrash Alphabetoth 1, end (Battei Midrashoth, 2nd ed. II, p. 422). Although preserved in a late midrashic work, this Aggadah has a basis in early sources, cf GR 5:1 and 28:2, ed. T-A, pp. 32 and 260, and the parallels cited ad loc.. The proof-text employed in this passage is of additional interest, as clause B of Job 23:13, ונפשו אותה וי', implies that God's desire or will was the primal force in the creation. This notion was current in the

Middle Ages, as can be seen from Sa'adiah's Arabic translation of the Bible (ed. Derenbourg, p. 5ff), where the Gaon translates the verb בָּרָא in the Genesis account of the creation, as though it were בָּרַח (see also Ibn Ezra's commentary to Gen. 1:3; also Maimonides, "Moreh Nebhukhim" I, 65). However, we can trace this concept back to a much earlier period. In Gnostic thought, BOULE, the hypostatized will of God, fashioned herself into a cosmos, imitating the archetypal Cosmos (cf Jonas, "The Gnostic Religions", Boston 1958, p. 149).

34. Baraita in Yoma 54b; cf also MHG to Gen. 1:1 (ed. Marg., p. 12).

35. Lit. "When the dust runneth together into a mass etc.". Presumably, R. Eliezer has rendered מַצֵּיב ($\sqrt{\text{מַצֵּ}}$) as though it were מַצֵּב (from the cognate root $\sqrt{\text{מַצֵּ}}$), a pillar or foundation (cf II Sam. 2:8, מַצֵּבֵי אֲרֶץ "the pillars of the earth"). Similarly, מָצַח has been associated with the same root, hence "to lay", or "to compress"; see Targum and Rashi on Job ad loc..

36. Lit. "For He said to the snow: Fall thou upon the earth". It is not at all clear how R. Joshua was able to derive a support for his view from this verse. Rashi (ad loc.) suggests that the allusion in the verse to four sources from which the primordial snow issued ($\text{מִטָּה, מִשָּׁמַיִם, מִמַּטְרֵה, מִמַּטְרֵה}$), implies that the creation began at the four

sides of the world, and not its middle. However, Luria (on PRE 3) argues that this verse was not cited to support the notion that the world was created from its sides, but merely to refute the argument of R. Eliezer. Just as snow when it falls, is not restricted to the one place, but falls over a wide area, so the creation of the world did not begin at one particular point. Although Luria's interpretation of the imagery of the snow is supported by R. Judah b. Pazzi's statement (see the next note) which he quotes, it is improbable that R. Joshua has cited his proof-text merely to refute his colleague's opinion, rather than to support his own view.

37. Cf Hastings, "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics" IV, p. 128. In PT Hag. ii, 77a, R. Judah (b. Simon) b. Pazzi actually traces the chain from water through snow to earth:...בתחילה היה העולם מים במים ... חזר ועשאו שלג.

(see also PRE op. cit.; Pesikta Hadh'tha, Eisenstein, אוצר המדרש, p. 487).

38. Cf GR 1:6 (and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 4). This Aggadah, which appears in its most original form in R. Judah b. Simon's statement, has been combined in our sources with a number of elements from other legends. In Tanh. B. I, p. 8, reference is made to a גוש של שלג, "a mass of snow", from which the world was

formed, which is reminiscent of R. Eliezer's theory of a central foundation from which the world was created (see above, p. 197). In PRE (loc. cit.), the snow is described as being taken from beneath the Divine Throne, a notion borrowed from the context of the second Aggadah quoted above, where dust figures as the primordial element (in PRE, Job 38:38, *באקת עפר למוצק*, is introduced as well as the more appropriate proof-text, 37:6). In Midrash Konen (Jellineck, BHM II, p. 24; Eisenstein, op. cit., p. 254), both the notions of the creation of the world from a central mass of snow, and the Divine Throne, are combined with a further aggadic element, taken from an unrelated complex of legends, the formation of the world from a foundation stone cast by God into the primordial depths (see above, p. 199):

יום ראשון נטל
גוש של שלג מתחת כסא הכבוד וזרק על פני המים באמצעו של
עולם ונעשה ארץ, שנאמר *כי לשלג יאמר הוא ארץ* (איוב ל' ז'
6). *ולקח אבן שתיה וירה אותה במקום בית המקדש ונתיסד*
עליה עולם, שנאמר "או מי ירה אבן פנתה (שם, ל' ח' 6)".

(see also Kalir's piyyut for rain in the Ashkenazzi liturgy for the eighth day of Sukkoth: *דבר והעריך תפתה* ביסדו חלד: also Sid. Sa'adiah, p. 348, line 4: *משליגת מים* (see also N. Wieder, JJS IV, p. 37)).

39. Daniel 2:22.

40. Viz. Oinamois the pagan philosopher, contemporary of R. Meir, cf Graetz, "Geschichte der Juden..." (4th ed.)

IV, pp. 175 and 434; Schürer (3rd ed.) II, pp. 42 and 126; see also Theodor's notes to GR 65:20, p. 734.

41. Cf Ex. R. 13:1; also MHG to Gen. 1:3, ed. Marg., p.20-21, where the question is addressed initially to R. Meir, and not to the Rabbis as in Exodus Rabbah.

42. Or, "When I (viz. God, the speaker in chapter 38) poured out the dust ...", see Rashi ad loc..

43. Cf "Das Wasseropfer und die damit verbundenen Zeremonien" MGWJ LIV (1910), p. 713ff, and LV, p. 43ff; see also Altmann, "Gnostic Themes in Rabbinic Cosmology", op. cit., p. 20ff, for valuable material on the significance of the stone-imagery in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic thought. An allusion to the "smooth stones" from which darkness emanates, has been incorporated into the Targum to Job 28:3, אבנין מפולמן : אבן אפל וצלמות, (see also Hag. 12a).

44. Cf Ginzberg, "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 14, note 39; also p. 16, note 40.

45. Cf Baraita in Yoma 54b. The reading 'צחק נפחא' is supported by Yalkut Job 923; Mayan Gannim on Job ad loc., ed. Buber, p. 122, and is confirmed by the non-European source, Midrash ha-Gadol to Gen. 1:1 (ed. Marg. p. 12). It is defended by Ginzberg (loc. cit., p. 14, note 39) against Rabbinowicz (who wishes to delete נפחא,

cf Dikdukei Soph'rim to Yoma ad loc.), on the basis of Tosephta 'Erubhin vii (ed. Zucker. p. 146) where a Tanna Isaac Nappaḥa is cited. However, the correct reading in this source is probably בִּן נִפְתָּה, or בִּן נִפְתָּה (cf Lieberman, Tosephta Kipheshutah, Mo'ed p. 393).

46. Lit. "Or who laid the cornerstone thereof?". The Midrash has taken יָרָה in its literal meaning, "to cast", cf Ex. 15:4 (where both the verbs יָרָה and טָבַע occur as in Job 38:6). See also Targum to Job ad loc., אוּ מִן שָׂדֵה אֲבִן זִוְיָתָה? with slight variations, in a fragment of a Midrash to the Torah published by Mann from the Genizah (cf "The Bible as read and preached etc." I, Hebrew Section, p. 54:

בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׂעָה לֹא הָיוּ אֵלָּא מֵיִם בְּלִבָּד וְאֶרֶץ לֹא הָיְתָה עַד שְׁנִטְלָה
הַקֶּבֶה אֲבִן וְזָרְקָה בְּמֵיִם, וְאַחֲרַיִךְ כֵּךְ עֲמִידָה הָאֶרֶץ, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר "עַל
מֵה אֲדֹנִיָּה הִטְבְּעוּ [אוּ מִי יָרָה אֲבִן פִּנְתָּה]".

47. Cf GR 5:8, and Theodor ad loc., p. 37, for parallels.

48. The notion of גְּעֵרָה, which occurs also in connection with the creation of the heavens (see above, p. 202), and the subjugation of the primordial sea (cf Hag. 12a, the statement of Resh Lakish: בְּשָׁעָה שֶׁבִּרְאָה הַקֶּבֶה אֶת הַיָּם הָיָה (מִרְחִיב וְהוֹלֵךְ עַד שֶׁגֵּעַר בּוֹ הַקֶּבֶה וַיִּבְשּׁוּ), is once again an echo of early mythological traditions, "rebuke" being a key-word in ancient mythological texts (see particularly Cassuto, p. בְּנִסְתָּ לְזִכְרֵהּ.נ. בִּיאֲלִיק, ה' שִׁירַת הָעֲלִילָה בִּישְׂרָאֵל

132 (29); see also Psalm 106:9, and Nahum 1:4).

49. Cf Hag. loc. cit.. Scholem ("Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism", p. 74) suggests that this whole passage preserves a trace of Jewish Gnostic speculation. However, Scholem's rendering of גַּעְרָה simply as "appeal", is unacceptable. In the light of the material cited in this chapter, and in view of the early mythological background for the notion of rebuke, it is clear that the expression גַּעְרָה in the context of rabbinic cosmogony, is to be taken in its most forceful sense.

50. Lit. "The pillars of heaven tremble and they are astonished at His rebuke.". Presumably, Rav has associated $\sqrt{\text{רַפָּה}}$ with its cognate root $\sqrt{\text{רַפָּה}}$, "to be loose", hence "out of control". Similarly, he has taken $\sqrt{\text{הִמָּה}}$ in its basic meaning of "to stand still", hence "to halt in amazement" (cf Gesenius, Dictionary, sub הִמָּה). In this Babylonian source, the notion of גַּעְרָה is actually associated with the idea of: "שָׂדִי", אֲנִי הוּא שְׂאֵמֶרֶתִי
"לְעוֹלָם הִי". However, in the Palestinian source, GR 12:10 (ed. T-A, p. 109), R. Judah b. Simon, on the basis of the expression בְּהִבְרָאָם (Gen. 2:4), suggested that the rebuke uttered by God was merely the ejaculation "Ha!": ר' בְּרַכִּי: "Ha!"
בְּשֵׁם ר' יְהוּדָה ב'ר' סִימֹן אָמַר: לֹא בַעֲמַל וְלֹא בִּיגִיעָה בְּרָא
הַקֶּבֶה אֶת עוֹלָמוֹ אֶלָּא בְּדִבְרֵי ה' וּכְבֹר הַשָּׁמַיִם נַעֲשׂוּ, [בְּהִבְרָאָם] -
בְּהֵא" בְּרָאם (הַשְׁחָה כֶּתִי לֹונְדוֹן) ! מִשַּׁל לְמֶלֶךְ שֶׁנֶּזֶף בַּעֲבֹדוֹ
וְעַמַּד לוֹ תַמִּיָּה, כֵּךְ "עַמּוּדֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם יִרְפּוּ וַיִּתְמָהוּ מִגַּעְרָתוֹ".

51. Cf GR 1:14, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 12.
52. Cf "The Marmorstein Memorial Volume", p. 89.
53. Cf. "The Jung Codex", p. 66-67.
54. Cf GR 1:15 (ed. T-A, p. 13, for parallels).
55. Loc. cit..
56. Cf ibid., 4:2 (ed. T-A, p. 26); also PT Berakh. i, 2c, and Rashi on Gen. 1:6.
57. The reading שמים is supported by MS Paris, and a gloss in MS London, while the main text reads מעשים, so MSS Vatican and Oxford 1, also PT Berakh. loc. cit..
58. This notion of the hardness or firmness of the heavens is reflected in R. Hanina's exposition of Job 37:18, 'תרקיע עמו שחקים וגו' (cf PT Berakh. loc. cit.; also GR 12:13, ed. T-A, p. 111; also a fragment of a Midrash on the Torah published by Mann, op. cit., p. 38): "תרקיע עמו שחקים חזקים כראי מוצק": "תרקיע" מלמד שהן עשוין כסס, יכול שאינן בריאין, תלמוד לומר "חזקים", יכול שהן נתרפין, תלמוד לומר "כראי מוצק", בכל שעה ושעה נראין מוצקים.
(lit. 'Canst thou with Him spread out the sky, which is strong as a molten mirror?'): The expression תרקיע implies that the heavens are made like a beaten metal foil (taking the finite verb תרקיע as a noun like תלמיד or תפקיד). You might think that

they are not firm, therefore, the verse describes them as חזקים, 'strong'. You might think that they become slack, therefore, it says כראי מוצק, at all times they appear as though they had just been cast.").

The conclusion of this passage is not satisfactory. The implication that the heavens might become slack is not countered by ...'ל, "כראי מוצק", בכל שעה ושעה וגו'... This imagery of the cast, or bright metal belongs to Resh Lakish's exposition of the verse which follows in the Yerushalmi. In the Genizah fragment cited above, the reading is כנרתקין, which Mann emends to כנרתקין (see Theodor's notes loc. cit., where this reading is presupposed in a manuscript commentary to Genesis Rabbah) thus, "at all times they appear as though enclosed in a case". However, this reading is equally unsatisfactory, as it does not correspond with the concluding words of the proof-text, כראי מוצק, of which it is intended to be an exposition. We would suggest, therefore, that כנרתקין viz. NARTHEX, is to be taken in the more literal sense of a tall, sturdy plant, suggesting a pillar, hence, "at all times the heavens appear as firm as a Narthex". We would suggest further, that the original reading of the Yerushalmi was כמזוקים (for מוצקים) "pillars" which was an explanatory gloss for the more obscure term נרתקין.

two Middoth, Middah 12.

60. Lit. "By His breath the heavens are serene". Possibly R. Johanan has taken the expression in its more restricted meaning of smoothing, or tending to a new-born babe, hence the breath of God smoothed out the newly formed heavens.

61. Cf GR 4:7 (ed. T-A, p. 31).

62. Lit. "descends into it".

63. See above, note 50. The continuation of the verse
וַיִּתְמַהוּ מִגֵּעָתוֹ, is not found in printed editions, or any of the manuscripts. However, as Luria (ad loc.) notes, R. Isaac's parable of the rennet hinges upon the expression גֵּעָה in the second clause, which acted like rennet on the liquid heavens. For a further example of this imagery, in connection with the formation of the embryo, see GR 14:5 (ed. T-A, p. 129) on Job 10:10-11.

64. The text here is emended on the basis of Luria; printed editions read: עָמְדוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם נִיתָן בָּהֶם אֶת הַמָּסוּ.
MS London omits the phrase עָמְדוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם.

65. This emendation is suggested once again by Luria, printed editions read: וַיְהִי עָרֹב וַיְהִי בֹקֶר יוֹם שֵׁנִי. Although not supported by any manuscripts or early printed editions, this emendation makes good sense, the rebuke uttered by God to the heavens is represented by the words

יְהִי רָקִיעַ (cf also Einhorn ad loc.). We may note further that this same source preserves an alternative suggestion for the etymology of the expression שָׁמַיִם in connection with Job 20:27. שָׁמַיִם may be read as שְׁמַיִם, "evaluators", implying that the heavens assess the deeds of men: שְׁמַיִם כְּתִיב, שֶׁהֵן שְׁמַיִם מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם שֶׁל בְּרִיאֹת, אִם זָכוּ, הַגִּידוּ שְׁמַיִם צַדִּיקוֹ (תה' צ' 6), וְאִם לֹא, הַגִּידוּ שְׁמַיִם עֲוֹנוֹ."

66. On Adam as a pre-cosmic god among the Gnostics, cf Jonas, "The Gnostic Religions", p. 217; also Ginzberg, "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 79, note 22, and p. 127, note 138.

67. Cf Battei Midrashoth, 2nd ed. II, p. 170; on the imagery of the artist commissioned to create a likeness, see Mechilta Beshallah, Shir'tha 8 (ed. Friedmann, p. 42a).

68. It is noteworthy that this verse was invested with polemical significance in early times. According to Tanh. OV Bereshith 5, the Sadducees employed this verse as the basis for their denial of the after-life. It is possible, therefore, that the above passage contains a retort to the Sadducean interpretation of this verse.

69. Cf ARN Vers. B, xxiv, p. 48-49, and the parallels cited by Schechter ad loc.; also Pesikta p. 3a (and the parallels cited by Mandelbaum, p. 5).

70. Cf Jonas loc. cit..

71. Ibid., p. 154.
72. Cf GR 12:8 (ed. T-A, p. 106-7); the reading ר' ש בן is found in MS Oxford 2, and is supported by Lev. R. 9:9 (see also the MSS cited by Margulies ad loc., p. 193). However, in Tanh. B I, p. 11, this Aggadah appears in the name of R. Shimon b. Lakish (in connection with Prov. 3:19), which is substantiated by Yalkut Proverbs 935, and by the extra-European source Midrash ha-Gadol to Lev. 7:11 (ed. Rab. p. 142).
73. Text emended on the basis of MS London; printed editions continue with Resh Lakish's exposition of this verse, which is out of context in this passage, and which is omitted in Lev. R., Tanh. B., and Midrash ha-Gadol.
74. Cf GR 8:5 (and Theodor ad loc. p. 60, for parallels); Tanh. B. IV, p. 110 (and the parallels cited by Buber ad loc.); also Tosephta Soṭah 6:5 (ed. Zuck. p. 304).
75. Cf "The Rabbinic Adam Legends", JQR XXXV, 1944-45, p. 371ff.
76. Cf ARN Vers. B, viii, ed. Schechter p. 23, also Vers. A, i end, and the material cited by Schechter ad loc. p. 8.
77. So Midrash, taking צרתני as נצרתני (lit. "Thou hast beset me behind and before").

78. MS Halberstam adds: שְׁמֵלֹאכֵי הַשָּׂרָף אֵשׁ הֵם, שְׁנֵאֵמָר
 „מֵלֹאכֵי אֵשׁ לֹוֹהֵט׃“

79. The tradition that the terms מִשְׁלַל and מִכָּאֵל in this verse refer to Gabriel and Michael gained wide currency (cf Targ. ad loc.; also the sources cited by Theodor in connection with GR 12:8, p. 106). It is possible that the notion of the angels' attempt to incinerate Adam, presupposes the tradition that Gabriel is the angel of fire (Yoma 21b).

80. Cf F.R. Tennant, "The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin", Cambridge 1903; also the more recent analysis of these sources by S.S. Cohon, in HUCA XXI (1948), pp. 275-330; see further, G.F. Moore, "Judaism", pp. 474-496; K. Kohler, "Jewish Theology", New York 1928, chap. 35.

81. Cf 2:23-24. In the Wisdom of Solomon, as in I Enoch, the Devil has replaced the Serpent of the biblical account (see Cohon, op. cit., p. 287).

82. Cf 17:1ff.

83. Cf GR 16:1 (ed. T-A, p. 142; also 21:4, p. 200); also Yalkut Job 906. The late source Bereshith Rabbathi, records ten decrees made against Adam at the time of his fall, the ninth being the shortening of his days, a detail deduced from Job 14:1, קֶצֶר יָמָיו, שָׁן „אָדָם יָלוּד׃“

אשה קצר ימים ושבע רגל.

84. Lit. "Thou prevailest forever against him, and he passath; Thou changest his countenance and sendest him away".

85. See above, p. 215 , note 14.

86. Cf GR 11:2 (ed. T-A, p. 88). The reading R. Ammi is supported by MSS Oxford 2, and Munich, also early printed editions and Yalkut; however, see Theodor's remarks ad loc.

87. So MS London. Printed editions read לו' which is supported by MSS, however, in view of ל'לו, the active form of the verb is preferable to the passive.

88. Cf also GR 12:6 (ed. T-A, p. 103); PR 23, p. 118a; Tanh. B. I, p. 13 (OV, Bereshith 6). The notion that Adam retained the splendour of his countenance during the Sabbath, belongs to the tradition that God actually blessed the first Sabbath with the light of Adam's face (and not the Primordial Light, see GR and PR loc. cit.). Einhorn, however, suggests that Adam's reprieve during the first Sabbath is related to the tradition that the Sabbath defended Adam from his impending punishment (cf PRE 19; Midrash Ps. 92, ed. Buber p. 404; PR 46, p. 187b; also Ginzberg, op. cit. Vol. V, p. 112, note 103).

89. See, for example, GR 8:1, and the numerous parallels

cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 54-55. On the notion of the Microcosmos in the writings of Philo, see Freudenthal, "Hellenistische Studien" I, p. 70.; also Weinstein, "Zur Genesis der Agada", pp. 52 and 79.

90. GR 21:3 (ed. T-A, p. 199-200).

91. The existing Targum on this verse reads: אִין יִסֵּק
לְצִיָּת שְׁמַיָּא וְוִקְפִּיָּה, וְרִישִׁיָּה לְעֻנָּא יִמְטִי.

92. So MS London; in printed editions, ןה is not found; see also next note.

93. Gen. 3:22, "Behold man has become like one of us"; the Midrash, however, has taken ןה as ןה (= ןח, ןחל), see Theodor's comment ad loc..

94. Op. cit., p. 288ff.

95. Cf 7:116-131, and 9:23-37; see also Cohon op. cit., p. 291ff. Cohon suggests that the particularly pessimistic outlook of this writer was influenced by the catastrophe of 70 CE.

96. Cf 54:15 and 19; 56:6; also Tennant op. cit. p. 212.

97. The notion that the Torah is the remedy for the evil inclination, has its counterpart in rabbinic sources, cf Kid. 30b, and particularly BB 16a, where, on the basis of 10:7, Job challenges God as the uninhibited creator of both the permissible and the prohibited, of both

the good and the evil in the world: אמר רבא: בקש איוב
לפטור את כל העולם כולו מן הדין. אמר לפניו „רבשׁע, בראת
שור פרסותיו סדוקות, בראת חמור פרסותיו קלוטות, בראת גן
עדן בראת גיהנם, בראת צדיקים בראת רשעים, מי מעכב על
ידך?“. ומאי אהדר ליה חבריה? „אף אתה תפר יראה ותגרע
שיחה לפני קל?“, ברא הקב״ה יצר הרע, ברא לו תורה תבלין.

98. Cf Tanh. B. I, p. 21.

99. See also Tanh. B. IV, p. 124; II Baruch 48:42-46;
The Book of Adam and Eve 10:2 (where Eve is distressed
at the thought of sinners cursing her for her failing to
obey God's injunction); see further Romans 5:12; Moore,
op. cit., p. 476.

Additional Note I: In Defence of the Creation and the Creator

The subject to which this note is devoted, has been anticipated in some measure by our observations on the work of the creation in general. We referred above to the apologetic undertones in many of the passages quoted, which stress God's supreme control over the elements and forces of the cosmos. Few, if any, of these passages were overtly polemical in character, and no particular school of heretical thought could be suggested as a possible target for the remarks which they contain. However, the statements to be considered in this note, leave little doubt regarding the particular target against which they were directed. A number of verses, particularly from the "creation-chapter" of the Book of Job, form the basis of polemical utterances clearly directed against some specific heretical notions which were current particularly in Gnostic circles in talmudic times.

On account of the cosmogonic material it contains, Job 38 figured prominently in cosmogonic theories both tannaitic and amoraic, as can be seen from the material quoted above. However, in none of the sources already discussed is any consideration given to the literary presentation of this chapter. While chapter 38 was clearly regarded as a Divine revelation of

information not included in the Genesis account of the creation, apparently no significance was attached to the context or setting for this information, the Divine challenge to mortal understanding. It is this particular aspect of chapter 38 which has been effectively exploited in the following passage by an unknown teacher, who has interpreted God's interrogation of Job as a condemnation of those who, amid their lack of knowledge, accuse God of not seeing and not knowing. While this passage is to be found only in a later source, its language, style and content, for which there are parallels in early sources, testify to its antiquity. It is interesting to note that, although this passage is directed against a common Gnostic claim, certain elements it contains seem to

betray clear Gnostic influences:¹ "ויען ה' את איוב מן הסערה ויאמר וגו'": אמר לו: הרני על ראשך, שהיית מבקשני. אמרת, אפילו הוא אינו רואה לרפאני מן המכות הללו שבגופי. א'ל הקב'ה "אזור נא כגבר חלצוך", הרני מרפא אותך כשם שהתרנגול הזה שהוא מנער מגופו כך אני מנער מגופו של איוב ורפאו (ומרפאו?) לשעה קלה. א'ל הקב'ה: "אזור נא כגבר חלצוך ואשאלך והודיעני", הרני שואלך כתלמיד ששואל את רבו, "איפה היית ביסדי ארץ?", שמא אתה נתת לי עצה שאברא את העולם הזה או הארץ הזאת שאתה עומד בה? מי אמר לי שאתקן את העולם לבני אדם? אמר לו: על מה הארץ עומדת? על העמודים, והעמודים על האדנים, והאדנים על בלימה, שנאמר "תולה ארץ על בלימה (כ' ז' 7)". ואם אין אתה מאמין, "שאו מרום עיניכם (יש' מ' 26)", למד מן הענין שאני עשיתי, התחתונים על מה הם עומדים? החמה ולבנה והמזלות על מה הם תלויין? על דבר שאין בו ממש ולא דמות בארץ, הארץ תלויה בו. "כי הנה יוצר הרים ובורא רוח (עמוס ה' 13)", מבקש אתה לידע על מה הארץ וההרים עומדים? הסתכל בעצמך על מה אתה עומד? הלא אתה נושא ונותן

על מה אתה עומד (לא) ברוח ששמתי בפיו? אם יצתה היא שמה
 בך צורך? אוי להם לרשעים שהם אומרים: אין הקב"ה רואה
 ויוצע. במה את רואה? במה את עושה מאשיו? ולא בנשמה
 שעשיתי ונתתי לך, יצתה ממך אין אתה כלום בעולם, הוצא
 רוחו ישוב לאדמתו (תהלים קמ"ו 4)".

(Job 38:1)² "And the Lord answered Job מן הסערה". He
 said to Job, 'Behold, I am above your head, since you
 were seeking Me, saying, "Even if He does not see fit to
 heal me from these plagues infesting my body!". God said
 to him, '"Gird up your loins like a cock (ibid., 3)", I
 am about to heal you! Just as the cock shakes out the
 dust from its body, so I will shake out the plagues from
 the body of Job,³ and heal him in an instant!'. Thus God
 said to Job, '"Gird up your loins like a cock, for I will
 demand of you, and you will declare unto Me ", I will
 question you like a pupil questions his teacher. "Where
 were you when I laid the foundations of the earth?
 (ibid., 4)". Perhaps you counselled Me to create this
 world, or this earth upon which you stand? Who told Me
 that I should furnish the world for the children of
 men?'. He said to Job, 'Upon what does the earth stand?
 upon the pillars, and the pillars upon the pedestals,
 and the pedestals upon Belimah,⁴ as it is said, " He
 suspends the earth upon Belimah (ibid., 26:7)". And if
 you do not believe Me, "Lift up your eyes on high (Is.
 40:26)", learn from that which I have made! Upon what do
 the lower regions stand? Upon what are the sun, moon and
 stars suspended? The earth is suspended upon that which

has no substance, nor anything comparable upon the earth
 namely, ⁵הָאָרֶץ, as it is said, "For He that forms the
 mountains and creates הָאָרֶץ (Amos 4:13)". Do you seek to
 know upon what the earth and the mountains stand?
 Consider yourself! Upon what do you stand? Do you not
 now discuss upon what you stand by means of the breath
 which I have put into your mouth?! Were it to depart
 from you, would you be of any consequence? Woe to the
 wicked who claim that God does not know or see! By what
 means do you see, or perform your functions? Is it not
 by means of the soul which I have made and given you?
 Once it has departed from you, you are nothing in the
 world! "His breath departs and he returns to the earth
 (Ps. 146:4)."'").

A further chapter from Job containing cosmogonic
 material which has been employed by the Rabbis as a basis
 for their own notions and theories, is chapter 26.⁶ The
 concluding verse of this chapter, verse 14, הֵן אֱלֹהֵי קֶצֶת
 זָרְכוּ וְמֵה שֶׁמֶץ דָּבָר נִשְׁמַע בּוֹ וְרַעַם גְּבוּרָתוֹ מִי יִתְבּוֹנֵן
 forms the climax of a panegyric to God the Creator, and his
 cosmic role. For the Amora, R. Huna, this verse
 represented a challenge to those who claim knowledge and
 comprehension of the cosmic order, presumably the Gnostic
 who, by this saving knowledge, hoped to liberate himself
 from the material prison created by the Demiurge.⁷ R. Huna,
 however, postulates that if one cannot comprehend the

mystery of the thunder, how can one presume to know the greater mystery of the universe itself! We may note the possibility that R. Huna's choice of the phenomenon of thunder in his diatribe, may reflect influences other than the mere wording of Job 26:14. In his description of the Orphitic Diagram quoted by Origen, Celsus states the following, "The Archon of the so-called Archontics is the accursed God of the Jews, who makes rain and thunder".⁸ Perhaps this Gnostic concept was known to R.

Huna and prompted him to challenge his imaginary opponent to explain the mysterious implications of thunder, which is one of the least of God's miraculous doings:⁹ "אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם": "הן אלה קצות דרכו ומה שמץ דבר נשמע בו ורעם גבורתו מי יתבונן". אמר ר' הונא: כל מה שאת רואה קצות דרכיו של הקב"ה הן, "הן אלה קצות דרכו". "ומה שמץ דבר נשמע בו", מה שמצוין נשמע בו? "ורעם גבורתו מי יתבונן", א"ר הונא: הרעם הזה בשעה שהוא יוצא כתיקונו אין כל בריה יכולה לעמוד עליו, "אין מתבונן" אין כתיב כאן, אלא "מי יתבונן", הפיקחים יודעים רימוזו והגיונו, א"ר הונא: אם על סדרו של רעם אי אתה יכול לעמוד, על סדר העולם על אחת כמה וכמה אתמהא? אם יאמר לך אדם "יכול אני לעמוד על סדרו של עולם.", אמור לו "אחרי מלך בשר ודם אי אתה יכול לעמוד, אחרי מלך מלכי המלכים, הקדוש ברוך הוא אתה יכול לעמוד אתמהא?".

"These are the generations of heaven and earth when they were created (Gen. 2:4)': It is written, הן אלה קצות דרכו ומה שמץ דבר נשמע בו ורעם גבורתו מי יתבונן?

R. Huna said: Everything that you behold is but the outskirts of God's ways, as it is said, 'Lo, these are but

the outskirts of His ways - ¹⁰ ¹¹ -
 therefore what disparagement can be rumoured concerning
 Him?' ¹⁰ ¹¹ R. Huna said: When the
 thunder goes forth in full force, not every creature can
 understand it, for it is not written ¹² ¹² (viz.
 'none can understand'), but ¹³ ¹³ (viz. 'who can
 understand', implying that) certain receptive people can
 perceive its intimations and implications! ¹³ R. Huna said:
 If you are unable to understand the secret of thunder, ¹⁴
 how much less the order of the universe?! Therefore,
 should any man say to you, 'I am able to understand the
 order of the universe!' say to him, 'You are not able to
 understand the ways of a mortal king, are you then able
 to understand the ways of the supreme King of Kings!'" ¹⁴.

The remaining passage to be quoted in this note
 is once again preserved only in later sources. ¹⁵ Nonetheless
 in view of its contents and dramatic presentation, it
 warrants a place of importance in any study of anti-
 Gnostic polemics in rabbinic literature. In his
 passionate disavowal of any association between the
 Creator and the forces of corruption, both moral and
 physical, our unknown teacher displays a detailed
 knowledge of notions which, in all probability, had their
 origins among the followers of Marcion, who propounded
 the notion of God as the "Conditor Malorum", or "Malorum
 Factor". The homily hinges upon a verse which occurs

already in tannaitic times as the basis for anti-Marcionite utterances, Deut. 32:4,...¹⁶ 'הַצֹּר תָּמִים פָּעֵלוּ וְגו'.

to support his assertion that God is not the author of evil, the anonymous author of this homily adduces Job

34:10-11:¹⁷ [הַצֹּר תָּמִים פָּעֵלוּ כִּי כָל דַּרְכָּיו מִשְׁכָּט. קֵל אֱמוּנָה וְאִין עוֹל צָדִיק וְיֹשֶׁר הוּא:] הַכֹּל בְּרָא הַקֶּבֶה בְּעוֹלָמוֹ חוּץ מִמִּידַת הַשָּׁקֶר וּמִמִּידַת עוֹל, שֵׁנ 'הַצֹּר תָּמִים פָּעֵלוּ וְגו', וְאוֹמֵר 'ה' צָדִיק בִּקְרִבָּה לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה עוֹלָה...'', וְאוֹמֵר 'חֲלִילָה לְקָל מִרְשָׁע וְשָׂדֵי מַעוֹל. כִּי פֶעַל אָדָם יִשְׁלַם לוֹ וְכִבְרָת אִישׁ יִמְצָאוֹ'. מַעֲיֵד אֲנִי עָלֵי שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ שֶׁאִין כָּל בְּרִיָּה יוֹרֵד לִידֵי צַעַר אֶלָּא מִתּוֹךְ שְׂאוֹכֵל וְשׁוֹתָהּ (שִׂיאָכֵל וְיִשְׁתָּה) וְשִׂמַּח הוּא וְאִשְׁתּוֹ וּבָנָיו וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, נִפְטָר לֹן לְבֵית עוֹלָמוֹ. וְאִין פִּירוֹת וְתַבּוּאָה בְּאִין לִידֵי הִרְקָבָה אֶלָּא מִתּוֹךְ דַּרְכֵיהֶם שֶׁל בְּנֵי אָדָם. וְאִין עֵינֵיהֶם שֶׁל בְּנֵי אָדָם כִּי הוּתָּ בַּחֲצִי יְמֵיהֶם אֶלָּא מִתּוֹךְ דַּרְכֵיהֶם.... [וְאִין בְּנֵי נְאִין לִידֵי הַבֹּאֶשָׁה אֶלָּא מִתּוֹךְ דַּרְכֵיהֶם], וְאִין הַנָּשִׁים מִיִּטְמָאוֹת בְּזִיבָה אֶלָּא מִתּוֹךְ דַּרְכֵיהֶן.... צֵא וְלִמַּד מִדֶּרֶךְ אֶרֶץ, כָּלוּם אָדָם בּוֹנֶה בֵּית אֶלָּא עַל מִנַּת לְהַכְנִיִס בּוֹ פִּירוֹת, לְהַכְנִיִס בּוֹ כָּלִים, וְלְהַכְנִיִס בּוֹ כִּסְפִים, אִין לְהַצִּית בּוֹ אֶת הָאוֹר? אִין כֵּךְ בְּנֵי אָדָם מִדַּרְכֵיהֶם נִידוֹנִין בְּשִׁבִּיל לְהַצִּיל מִיּוֹם הַבֹּא.

¹⁸ ("The Creator, His work is perfect; for all His ways are judgement; a God of faithfulness and without iniquity, just and right is He (Deut. 32:4)'. God created everything in His world, save the principles of falsehood and iniquity! Thus it is said, 'The Creator, His work is perfect etc.', and it is said, 'Far be it from God that He should make wickedness, and from the Almighty that He should make iniquity (Job 34:10)', and it is said, 'For the work of a man will He requite unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways (ibid., 11)'.¹⁹ I

call upon heaven and earth to bear witness to Me that no creature falls into the clutches of pain, but through his eating and drinking and making merry with his family and all that he possesses, he departs to his eternal resting place! Nor are fruit and produce subject to rotting, save through the ways of the children of men. Nor do men's eyes become weak half-way through their lives, save on account of their own ways. Nor are men subject to decay through disease, save on account of their own ways. Nor do women become unclean through a menstrual flow save on account of their own deeds!

Take a lesson from mortal conduct! Does a man build a house save to put therein goodly produce, and to bring into it beautiful furniture and valuables, and to kindle a fire therein? So it is that the children of men are punished according to their ways ²⁰.... in order to deliver them from the day which is to come!").

In addition to the above-quoted material, we may refer to a particular type of statement which may also be of a polemical nature. The phrase לא כמדת הקב"ה

מדת בשר ודם, occurs widely in our sources, sometimes prefixed with the exhortation בא וראה, introducing a comment on the superiority or inscrutability of God's ways compared with those of men. ²¹A number of such

statements, relating to a variety of subjects, are based on verses from the Book of Job, ²²one group in particular,

relating to the miracle of conception and child-birth, will be considered under its own heading. Several of these statements relate to cosmogonic themes, the miraculous creation and maintenance of the heavens,²³ the miracle of rain-fall, a subject which has a special association with the Book of Job.²⁴ Generally speaking, the widely occurring statements of this pattern and format reflect a transcendental tendency in the rabbinic concept of God. Although we cannot discount the possibility that in the hostile atmosphere which prevailed in Palestine during the second and third centuries of the Common Era, utterances of this type also served to remove the Jewish God beyond the pale of offensive heretical criticism.

Notes

1. Wertheimer identifies this passage as a quotation from the lost מדרש איוב which was known to the compiler of Yalkut Makiri (cf Battei Midrashoth, 2nd ed. II, p. 155, also p. 184-5 for text and notes.).
2. The ensuing phrase הריני על ראשך, suggests that this verse was rendered as "And the Lord answered Job from among his hair", equating סערה with שער (cf GR 4:4, and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc. p. 28).
3. Both the imagery of the cock, and its application to the healing of Job have their parallels in older sources. Cf GR 75:1 (ed. T-A, p. 878, referring to Zach. 11:17 and Is. 52:2): א'ר אחא: כהדא תרנגולתא דמוערה גרמה. In PR 26, p. 132a (referring once again to Is. 52:2), this imagery is suggested in connection with Job who is the example for the raising of Israel from the dust: ... לאיוב נערתִי מן אשפה, ועליך הוא אומר „התנערי dust: "Moreover, if we accept Buber's emendation, מעפר קומי...". then we have an actual parallel for our passage in R. Judah's comment on Job 38:3 (cf Mid. Ps. to Ps. 103:5, p. 435, and note 40 ad loc.): ר' יודן פתר באיוב, „אזור, נא כגבר חלצִיך", כגבר (=תרנגול) שישב באשפה ומנער עצמו, כך איוב מנער את עצמו מן היסורין ונתחדש.
4. The original text reads simply עלמה, however, בלימה, better known from later texts (cf Sepher Yezirah,

beginning, ספירה בלימה; also Scholem, "Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism", p. 77), figures as a cosmogonic component already in older sources. See particularly Ex. R. 15:22, an extensive and highly significant passage, which has not been noted by Scholem in his comments on Jewish Gnostic speculations (op. cit., p. 73ff). It contains a large number of cosmogonic notions of a speculative nature, the generation of elements from three primordial components, water, air and fire; God's garment of light; the role of the Primordial Waters. According to an unknown Aggadist, this information was purposely concealed by Moses, only to be revealed by David in his Psalms; (see also Tanh. OV Hayye Sarah, 3).

Wertheimer has noted an interesting parallel for our passage above, in Hag. 12b (a source noted for its early mystical traditions reflecting Gnostic influence; cf Scholem, "Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition", p. 7; see also PT Hag. ii, 77a), where a further cosmic diagram introducing Job 9:6, is recorded in the name of R. Jose. Presumably, both this passage and the anonymous statement from Yalkut Makiri quoted above, which deals with the order of the cosmos, reflect what may have been the general speculative tendency in early Jewish Gnostic circles on the subject of מעשה בראשית (cf Scholem, "Major Trends...", loc. cit.; compare also the much lengthier and more detailed cosmic

description contained in Sedher Rabbah di-Bh'reshith,

Wertheimer, op. cit., I, p. 27ff): ר' יוסי אומר: אוי להם לבריות שרואות ואינן יודעות מה הן רואות, עומדות ואינן יודעות על מה הן עומדות, על העמודים, שנ' "המרגיז ארץ ממקומה ועמודיה יתפלצון", והעמודים על המים..... מים על ההרים וגו'.....

5. On רוח as a cosmic element, see R. Jose's statement in the preceding note, also Ex. R. loc. cit..

6. See above. pp. 194f , 199 and 201.

7. Cf R.M. Grant, "Gnosticism and early Christianity", (New York/London 1959) p. 10.

8. Cf Origen, "Contra Celsum" VI, 24-38 (translation by R.M. Grant, "Gnostic Anthology", London 1961, p. 89).

9. In older sources, this passage occurs only in GR 12:1 (T-A, p. 97-8); see, however, Yalkut Job 914, Mayan Gannim on Job ad loc. (ed. Buber, p. 83). See also מדרש חסידות on Job ad loc. (Wertheimer, op. cit., p. 317, para. 137).

10. This phrase is not found in printed editions, it is supported, however, by MSS London, Paris and Munich (see also Theodor on Genesis Rabbah ad loc., p. 97). As to the expression שִׁמְצוֹן this form is not found elsewhere in talmudic-midrashic sources. In all probability שִׁמְצוֹן is to be associated with the biblical שִׁמְצָה (Ex. 32:25), "a whispering", in a malicious sense, also the post-

biblical דבר של שממה "something disgraceful" (cf Lev. R. 20:10, although this reading occurs only in printed editions, and is not supported by any MSS evidence, cf ed. Marg. ad loc., p. 468); similarly, the masculine form שמץ "a blemish", or "suspicion" (cf Kid. 71b; also Pes. 3b). See further, Rashi and Ibn Ezra on Job ad loc., also Albeck's Introduction to Genesis Rabbah I, p. 53, where he suggests that this phrase has its origins in an early Targum to Job.

11. It is not clear how R. Huna rendered this clause. מדרש חסדו ויתרו (loc. cit.) records the following comment for this verse: "גבורתו" כתיב, שאין אדם יכול לעמוד על גבורה אחת מגבורותיו של הקב"ה..... It is possible that this interpretation of Job 26:14 underlies the statement of R. Huna, who understood this clause as "Who can comprehend His miracle (?) of thunder?".

12. So MSS London and Munich (see also Pseudo-Rashi ad loc.), printed editions read, נחבון.

13. This use of הגיון in this context is unusual, so that its precise rendering is difficult to determine. In view of the accompanying expression רימו, "intimation", the rendering "utterance", hence "noise", is inadequate. Jastrow (s.v. רימו, p. 1482) refers the phrase to God, "the wise understand his intimation (through thunder) and his plans (?)". However, we would suggest that הגיון in

this context is to be associated with הנה in the rare meaning of "to deduce" (cf PT Meg. i, 72b: הנה נח תורה מהנך תורה), hence "a deduction" or "implication".

14. The more usual rendering of סדרו של רעם as "the order of the thunder", is not satisfactory. Consequently, we would suggest that סדרו is an error for סתרו (= סודו? see my comment below, p. 305f note 4, on the expression סודי מרכבה = סודי מרכבה), hence "the secret (= "mystery") of thunder". This suggestion is substantiated by the reading preserved in Mayan Gannim (which Theodor discounts as an error), סודו של רעם.

15. Cf TBA Zutta 3 (ed. Fried. p. 175-6), which we have emended on the basis of the text quoted in Yalkut Deut. 942.

16. Cf Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 146-7, who has failed to note our source above.

17. Elsewhere in our sources, we find these two verses in statements of a polemical colouring relating to a subject more appropriate to ^{the} theme of Elihu's speech in chapter 34, the justice of God in the treatment of His creatures; cf Mech. d'R. Shimon b. Yohai, p. 66 (referring to the punishment of the Egyptians; see also Marmorstein op. cit., p. 150); Tanh. B. III, p. 35-6; see further GR 87:3 (ed. T-A, p. 1062), where verse 11 is

taken as a description of God's characteristic virtue (= אומנות , on the polemical colouring of this expression in connection with God's attributes, see Tanh. B. I, p. 91).

18. Cf Sifre on Deut. ad loc., 307 (p. 132b): הצ"ר
 שהוא צר העולם תחילה (see also Tanh. B. III, p. 33 on
 I Sam. 2:2: "אין צור כאלקינו", אין צ"ר כאלקינו.

19. In TBA Zutta, a new paragraph begins at this point, however, this is obviously a continuation of the preceding passage, elaborating on Job 34:11. Moreover, the exclamation מעיד אני עלי שמים וארץ, is clearly imitative of the opening verse of the Sedher (Deut. 32:1, (האזינו השמים.....ותשמע הארץ).

20. The text at this point is obscure, and defies any satisfactory reconstruction. Friedmann's edition reads,

דנין אותן מתוך דרך ארץ, which may mean, "He punishes (reading דן) them through the normal course of events (viz. natural occurrences to which all things are subject, decay, old age etc.)". In all probability, the reading in printed editions of TBA represents an attempt to overcome the expression דרך ארץ, difficult to interpret in this context, by introducing its usual counterpart, דברי

ודנין אותן מתוך שהם עברו על דברי תורה ועל תורה, thus:

דרך ארץ. It is further possible that the compiler of the Yalkut had difficulty with this phrase in his Vorlage,

as he simply omits it.

21. Naturally, we include under this heading the numerous statements which are not prefaced with this formula, but simply elaborate upon the superiority of Divine actions over those of mortals.

22. Cf Ex. R. 28:5 on Job 36:2 (God's contradictory roles of teacher and warrior, see above, p. 141); *ibid.*, 9:9 on Job *ibid.* (above, p. 142); *Menah.* 99b on Job 36:16 (God attracts a man to the ways of life); *Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai*, p. 93 on Job 25:2 (God's fear rests upon those who are near to Him, above, p. 85); *BB* 25a on Job 38:35 (the omnipresence of God proved by His emissaries' supernatural behaviour). One notion in particular occurs widely in our sources, usually in association with Job 9:17 and 38:1, refers to God's supernatural methods in healing, "A mortal inflicts an injury with a scalpel and heals with a plaster, but He who spoke and the world was, heals through the same instrument by which He inflicted the wound! (cf *Midrash Tan.* p. 176-7; *Mechilta Beshallah* ii, 5, p. 32a; also *wa-Yassa'*, i, p. 45b; *Mech. d'R. Shimon b. Yohai*, p. 64-65; *Tanh.* OV *Beshallah*, 23).

23. Cf *GR* 12:13 (ed. T-A, p. 111); *PT Berach.* i, 2c-d; also the new text of a Midrash on the Torah published by Mann from the Genizah (cf "The Bible as Read and Preached

in the Old Synagogue" I, Hebrew Section, p. 38). The following passage contains two views relating to the miraculous composition of the heavens, based upon the same verse, Job 37:18, תרקייע עמו שחקים חזקים כראי מוצק. In GR the two views are attributed to R. Isaac and Resh Lakish respectively. However, we have adopted the reading recorded in the other sources cited above, R. Johanan, as this teacher's discussions with Resh Lakish occur so widely in our sources: ר' יוחנן ור'ש לקיש. ר' יוחנן אמר: בשר ודם מותח אוהל אנוקי על ידי שהות הוא רפי קימעה, ברם הכא "וימתחם כאהל לשבת", ואם תאמר שהן רפים, ת'ל "תרקייע עמו שחקים חזקים". ר'ש לקיש אמר: בשר ודם מוסך בולם אנוקי על ידי שהות הוא מעלה חלודה, ברם הכא, "תרקייע עמו שחקים חזקים כראי מוצק" - נראין כמין תרקייה.

"R. Johanan and Resh Lakish held differing views. R. Johanan said: When a mortal spreads a tent, it will perforce (=ANANKE) slacken a little with the passage of time, but with God (when He created the heavens) 'He spread them out like a tent for dwelling (Is. 40:22, so PT and Genizah text)'. And should you suggest that they grow slack, then it is said, 'Can you stretch out with Him the heavens, חזקים which are firm!'. Resh Lakish said: When a mortal casts a metal orb, it will perforce rust with the passage of time, but with God, 'With Him the skies are תרקייע, strong like a polished mirror.', the expression תרקייע implies that they appear like burnished breast-plates (=THORACHIA, cf Theodor ad loc.).

Although unusual, the expression מוסך is adequately

supported by MSS evidence. Similarly, the term בולס (=BOLOS) occurs in MSS Oxford 1 and 2, as well as the Genizah text (בילוסא); the reading in printed editions, PT and Yalkut, בליס is clearly a corruption of the more unusual term (see Theodor ad loc.). Jastrow's rendering of בולס as a lump of glass (or, perhaps, "a lense"; cf Dictionary, sub בולס, p. 146) is not satisfactory in this context, as it is not in keeping with the imagery of a rust-producing article. Consequently we must also reject his equation of חרקה with חרקה =ANTHRACHION, a kind of gem (op. cit., p. 558). As to the notion of the firmness of the heavens, see above, p. 201, the statement of Rav; also p. 227, note 58, for a further interpretation of 37:18 in the name of R. Hanina. As to the theme common to the statements of both R. Johanan and Resh Lakish, the extraordinary quality of the fabric employed by the Creator, when compared with the artifacts of man, this notion may have been directed against the Marcionite concept of the world as a sorry product of an equally "sorry artificer" (cf Tertullian, "Against Marcion" Book I, xiii; also chapter xiv, where Tertullian implies that Marcion had some specific criticism of the skies, "You are an enemy to the skies, yet you are glad to catch its freshness in your houses!": trans. Holmes, Ante-Nicene Library VII, p. 26).

24. Cf Tanh. OV, Bereshith, 4 on Job 12:15: אמר ר' ברכיה: בנזהב שבעולם ספוג בידו עצרו, ירדו מים, פתח, עמדו המים, והקב' אינו כן, עצר, עמדו המים, שנאמר "הן יעצר" (R. Berechiah) המים ויבשו", פתח, ירדו המים.....
said: Normally, when a man holding a sponge squeezes it, the water pours down, and when he releases it, it stops. But with God it is not so. When He compresses the water, it stops, as it is said, 'He compresses the waters and they dry up,', and when He releases them the waters descend"). Presumably, R. Berechiah has invested the Hebrew expression עצר ("to withhold") with the meaning with which it is found in Aramaic, "to squeeze"; cf Jastrow, op. cit., sub עצר, p. 1103.

Additional Note II: Rabbinic Embryology

From the abundant material preserved in our sources, both tannaitic and amoraic, it is clear that the Book of Job occupied a place of great prominence in the embryological studies of the Rabbis.¹ A considerable number of notions, quasi-medical, theological, legendary and, perhaps, semi-mystical, have been associated almost exclusively with verses from the Book of Job. In some measure, this fact is self-explanatory, as certain passages contained in the Book of Job reflect notions relating to the formation and birth of a child which were probably current already in biblical times,

principally Job 10:10-12: הלא כחלב תתיכני וכגבינה

תקפיאני. עוד ונשר תלבישני ובעצמות וגידים תשככני. הים מסד

עשית עמדי ופקודתך שמרה רוחי. As can be seen from the material quoted below, such verses were employed by the Rabbis as a basis or receptical for their own notions and theories regarding the formation of the embryo.

There are a number of verses, however, which figure prominently in our sources on this subject, which have been taken from contexts bearing no relationship to conception and child-birth. We will endeavour to show subsequently that the selection and application of these verses reveal certain fundamental aspects of rabbinic thought regarding the miraculous nature of יצירת הולד, the conception and the developement of the embryo. X

We may observe initially that the available material exhibits certain distinct features, allowing for easy classification. The oldest sources, containing tannaitic statements, are purely anatomical in character, giving descriptive details regarding the make-up and development of the foetus, and are based on those verses which refer expressly to the formation of the embryo. In our earliest source, the School of Hillel employs the three verses quoted above, 10:10-12, to substantiate their view, against the School of Shammai, that the formation of the embryo in this world will be the model for its reconstruction in the hereafter.² The semi-Tanna, R. Hiyya, employed these same verses as a scriptural basis for his detailed description of the embryo in the early stages of its development.³ In the discussions between Rabbi and Antoninus, recorded in Sanhedrin 91b, verse 12 appears again as a proof-text which Rabbi cites to support his friend's view regarding the moment of life's entry into the foetus.⁴ Finally, the early Tanna, R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, based his observation on the nature of a woman's womb on Job 3:10, כִּי לֹא סִגְרָהּ דָּלְתָהּ, וְיָנִיבָהּ.⁵ Once again the context from which this verse is taken, relates - albeit in a negative manner - to conception and child-birth.

The second group of statements, found mainly in amoraic sources, exhibit a marked development both in

rabbinic thought on the subject of יצירת הולד, and in the exposition of verses from the Book of Job. The purely anatomical observations found in older sources, are augmented by mythological elements relating to the origins of the embryo's soul, its experiences and conditions while within the womb of its mother. Similarly, the selection of verses from Job is extended to sections of the book which have no bearing on the subject of conception and child-birth. The most significant examples of this allegorical exegesis, reflect a notion which is not explicitly formulated in any early rabbinic source, that the formation of the embryo in its mother's womb is a repetition in miniature of the creation of the world (see, however, ARN Vers. A, xxxi, ed. Schechter p. 91). This notion, which is derived from the much older concept of man as a microcosmos^{5a}, is developed particularly in one source, a treatise on the formation of the embryo, preserved in Tanhuma, Old Version, Pekudhei 3.^b This treatise ("סדר יצירת הולד") is presumably a later compilation containing much older material. The compiler asserts that, "when God created the world, He created it after the fashion of a human foetus (כשברא הקב"ה את עולמו, כילוד אשה בראו). Having illustrated his statement by drawing a parallel between the foetal navel and the אבן שתיא, he cites the following:

א"ר יוחנן: מאי דכתיב "עושה גדלות עד אין חקר ונפלאות עד מספר (איוב ט' 10)"? תדע לך שכל הנשמות שהיו מן אדם הראשון

ושיהיו עד סוף כל העולם, כולן נבראו בששת ימי בראשית וכולן
בגן עדן וכולן היו במקן תורה, שנ' 'כי את אשר ישנו פה עמנו
עומד היום ואת אשר איננו פה עמנו היום'. ומה שאמר 'עושה
גדלות עד אין חקר', אלו גדולות שעשה הקב"ה ביצירת הולד.
"R. Johanan said: Why is it written, 'He does great
things past finding out, yea, marvellous things without
number.'? Know that all souls from Adam until the very
end of the world, were all created during the six days
of the creation, all were in Eden,⁷ all of them were at
Sinai, as it is said, 'But with him that stands here
with us this day before the Lord our God, and also him
that is not here with us this day⁸ (Deut. 29:4)'. As for
the verse, 'He does great things past finding out etc.',
this refers to the formation of the embryo."

There appears to be no allusion in R. Johanan's
statement to the notion that there is a parallel between
the creation of the world and the formation of the embryo.
However, this may be implied in R. Johanan's choice of
proof-text, Job 9:10, which is identified with מעשה
בראשית, and is cited to support the interpretation of a
further verse with reference to this subject.⁹ We may
assume, therefore, from R. Johanan's application of this
verse to יצירת הולד, that he regarded this miracle as
comparable with that of מעשה בראשית.

This notion is reflected further in a
statement by a contemporary of R. Johanan b. Nappaha, R.
Simlai, who voices a tradition which is also

recorded in "סדר יצירת הולד". According to R. Simlai, the infant within its mother's womb enjoys a supernatural light, which, like that created on the first day, enables it to see from one end of the world to the other.¹⁰ R. Simlai's statement, which begins with an anatomical account of the embryo in the early stages of its existence, is based upon three verses from the Book of Job, which have been taken once again from a context which in no way relates to child-birth, 29: 2-4:¹¹

דרש ר' שמלאי: למה הולד דומה במעי אמו? לפנקס שמקופל ומונה ידיו על שתי צדעיו, שתי אציליו על שתי ארכבותיו, וב' עקביו על ב' עגבותיו, וראשו מונח לו בין ברכיו, ופיו סתום וטבורו פתוח, ואוכל ממה שאמו אוכלת ושותה ממה שאמו שותה, ואינו מוציא רעי שמא יהרוג את אמו, וכיון שיצא לאויר העולם, נפתח הסתום ונסתם הפתוח, שאלמלא כן אינו יכול לחיות אפילו שעה אחת, ונר דלוק לו על ראשו וצופה ומביט מסוף העולם ועד סופו, שנ' "בהלו נרו עלי ראשי לאורו אלך חשך", ואל תתמה שהרי אדם ישן כאן ורואה חלום באספניא. ואין לך ימים שאדם שרוי בטובה יותר מאותן הימים, שנאמר "מי יתנני כירחי קדם כימי קלוה ישמרני", ואיזהו ימים שיש בהם ירחים ואין בהם שנים? הוי אומר אלו ירחי לילה. ומלמדין אותו כל התורה כולה, שנאמר "וירני ויאמר לי יתמך דברי לבך שמור מצותי וחיה", ואומר "בסוד קלוה עלי אהלי".....".

"R. Simlai lectured: To what may the embryo in its mother's womb be compared? To a folded pinax, resting with its hands upon its two temples, its two elbows upon its two haunches, its two ankles upon its two buttocks, and its head is resting between its knees. Its mouth is

closed, and its navel open. It partakes of what its mother eats and drinks, but it does not excrete any waste-matter lest it kills its mother. Once it is born, the closed organs are opened, and the open organs are closed, were it not so, it could not survive for a single moment. While within the womb, a light burns over its head, by which it can survey from one end of the world to the other, as it is said, 'When His lamp shined over my head, and by His light I walked through darkness (Job 29:3)'. Nor should this surprise you, for a man can sleep here, yet dream about events in Spain! Moreover, a man was never better off than during that period of his life! thus it is said, 'Oh that I were as in the months of old, as in the days when God watched over me (ibid., 2)'. Which days can be numbered in months and not years? Surely, the months of pregnancy. During that period, the embryo is taught the whole of the Torah, as it is said, 'And He taught me: Let your heart retain My words, keep My commandments and live (Prov. 4:4).', and it is said, 'As when I was in my "winter-days" (viz. the period of moistness within the womb)¹², when the secret of God was upon my habitat (Job ibid., 4)'.....".

We may note in conclusion, that the imagery employed in the Book of Job itself clearly implies that

the creation was, in one important aspect, a momentous cosmic birth. In chapter 38, a chapter noted for its cosmogonic material, and figuring prominently in the Rabbis' discussions on the creation, the emergence of the primordial ocean - the basic cosmic component - is vividly described in terms of the emergence of the new-born child (verses 8-11):¹³

ויסך בדלתים ים בגיחו מרחם יצא. בשומי ענן לבושו וערפל חתולתו. ואשבר עליו חוקי ואשים בריה ודלתים. ואמר עד פה תבוא ולא תוסיף ופה ישית בגאון גליך.

It is noteworthy that these verses, clearly cosmogonic in character and context, are applied in our sources to the birth of a human child, which strongly suggests that child-birth was regarded as a repetition in miniature of the original cosmic event:¹⁴

"בגיחו מרחם יצא", על ידי שמתגאה לצאת, "בשומי ענן לבושו", זה השפיר, "וערפל חתולתו", זה השליא, "ואשבר עליו חוקי", אלו חשעה חדשים, "ואשים בריה", אלו שלושה חדשים הראשונים, "ודלתים", אלו שלושה חדשים האמצעיים, "ואמר עד פה תבוא ולא תוסיף", אלו ג' חדשים האחרונים, "ופה ישית בגאון גליך", ר' איבו אמר: בגאון גלליך, לפי שהולד הזה כשהוא יוצא מלא גלליך וכל מיני סירוחין והכל מחבקין אותו, וביותר אם הוא זכר, הדא הוא דכתיב "אשה כי תזריע וילדה זכר".

which implies that the foetus expands in the womb in order to emerge,¹⁵ בשומו ענן לבושו, this refers to the placenta, ואשבר עליו חוקי, this refers to the nine months of pregnancy,¹⁶ ואשים בריה, this refers to the first three months, ודלתים, this refers to the middle three months, ואמר עד פה תבוא ולא תוסיף, which refers to the last three months; ופה ישית בגאון גליך

R. Aybu said: This phrase is to be taken as 17
ר'בבא ר'אבא
'Your dung is upon the object of your exaltation!'. For the child, when it emerges, is covered with dung and all manner of nauseous substances, yet everyone embraces it, especially if it is a boy! Hence it is written, 'If a woman conceives and bears a son (Lev. 12:2)'.¹⁷".

The remaining group of statements differs from the preceding material in format and presentation rather than in content. The passages already discussed were purely informative in character, containing notions and theories, both factual and legendary. However, in a number of sources, we find elements of these anatomical and mythical notions adduced for a specific purpose, to demonstrate the super-human qualities of the Creator as manifested in His miraculous treatment of the human embryo. We have already noted the statement of R. Hanina who, on the basis of Job 9:10, stresses the superiority of Divine attributes over those of mortals, as is demonstrated in God's miraculous preservation of the child in its mother's womb.¹⁸ A similar observation is made by the Amora, R. Abba Kahana, on the basis of Job 10:12. On the basis of this same verse, R. Eliezer b. Pedath praises God for protecting the embryo amid a heat so intense as to be fatal to an adult. R. Tahlipha of Caeserea saw in this same verse an allusion to the inexplicable fact that a woman's food and drink do nothing

to dislodge her unborn child.¹⁹ Of particular significance are three statements or observations made by the Amora R. Levi, in connection with Job 36:3, אשא דעי למרחוק

R. Aha, quoted by R. Shemuel b. Idi, makes an unusual comment on this verse: "If Elihu said this himself, then it is praiseworthy, but if it were inspired by God, then it merits the utmost praise!".

R. Levi proceeds to elaborate upon this exclamation in the following manner:²⁰

בנוהג שבעולם מפקיד אדם אצל חברו [אנקיא] (ארנקי) של כסף בחשאי ומחזיר לו ליטרא של זהב בפרהסיא, אינו מחזיק לו טובה? כך הקב"ה מפקידין לו הבריות טפה של לבנונית בחשאי, והקב"ה מחזיר להם נפשות משובחות שלמות בפרהסיא, ואין זה שבה? "אשא דעי למרחוק ולפועלי אתן צדק".

ר' לוי אמר אחריו: בנוהג שבעולם אדם חבוש בבית האסורין אין כל בריה משגחת עליו, בא אחד והדליק לו שם נר, אינו מחזיק לו טובה? כך הקב"ה, הולד שרוי במעי אמו ומאיר לו שם נר, הוא שאיוב אומר "בהלו נרו עלי ראשי", אין זה שבה? הוי "לפועלי אתן צדק".

ר' לוי אומר אחריו: בנוהג שבעולם אדם חבוש בבית האסורין ואין כל בריה משגחת עליו, בא אחד והתירו והוציאו משם, אינו מחזיק לו טובה? כך הולד שרוי במעי אמו ובא הקדוש ברוך הוא והתירו והוציאו משם [אין זה שבה? הוי "לפועלי אתן צדק (השחה כת' י מונכין)"] .

"Normally, if a man were to deposit an ounce of silver in secret with his friend, and he were to return him a pound of gold publicly, would he not be doing him a good turn?! So it is with God. Mortals deposit with Him a drop of whiteness²¹ in secret, and God returns to them in public

complete, praiseworthy beings, is this not laudable?! Thus, 'I will set my mind upon that which is too distant to comprehend, that I may ascribe righteousness to my Maker.'.

"R. Levi gave a further exposition of this verse: Normally, when a man is incarcerated in a prison, nobody taking any notice of him, and someone comes and lights a lamp for him, is he not doing him a good turn?! So it is with God. While the foetus is lodged within its mother's womb, He lights a lamp for it, as Job has said, 'When His lamp shined over my head etc.... (Job 29:3)', is this not laudable?! Thus, '... I may ascribe righteousness to my Maker'.

"R. Levi gave a further exposition of this verse: Normally, when a man is incarcerated in a prison, nobody taking any notice of him, then someone comes and releases him, bringing him forth from there, is he not doing him a good turn?! Thus the embryo is lodged in its mother's womb, and God comes, releasing it and bringing it forth from there, is this not laudable?! Thus, '... I may ascribe righteousness to my Maker'."

As we observed above, the content of these statements does not differ in essence from the material quoted earlier. It is clear, however, from the manner of their presentation, that these statements were intended to

convey something more than information. We have suggested elsewhere that this tendency to stress the superiority of Divine qualities and actions over those of mortals, may have assumed polemical significance as a result of heretical activity in Palestine.²² It is possible, therefore, that the subject of child-birth may have entered into polemical discussions during the amoraic period, from which all the above statements emanate. This is plausible particularly in view of the notions voiced in some Gnostic circles regarding marriage and procreation, which are condemned as institutions of the satanic Demiurge, by which the souls of men are seduced.²³ It is highly probable, therefore, that the above-quoted statements lauding the marvels performed by the Creator in fashioning the embryo, were directed against Gnostic teachings. We may speculate further that the Gnostic attempt to discredit procreation as the work of the Demiurge, may have provoked within rabbinic circles the notion referred to above, that the formation of the embryo is a miracle equal to the work of creation itself.

Notes

1. The aggadic aspects of rabbinic embryology still require a detailed and critical analysis, particularly with reference to the origins of the notions preserved in our sources. See, however, J. Preuss, "Biblisch-talmudische Medizin", Berlin 1911, pp. 448-451, particularly p. 449, where he cites parallels for rabbinic Aggadah in the writings of Aristotle, Galen etc.. See also Gaster's comments in Hastings, "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics", II, p. 654f; also the material collected by Ginzberg from both Jewish and non-Jewish sources, "Legends of the Jews" V, p. 75ff; see further the early attempts of M. Güdemann to find a background in Ancient Near-Eastern traditions for some of the material in rabbinic sources, "Mythenmischung in der Haggada, ein Beitrag zur Jüdischen Sagenschichte, wie zur Mythologie der Aegypter, Phöniker und Griechen", MGWJ XXV (1876), p. 181ff.

Although no explicitly formulated tradition associating the subject of embryology with the personality of Job is preserved in our sources, we may note the following passage which describes Job as meditating upon the miracle of child-birth (Tanh. B. III, p. 34; OV,

רבותינו אמרו: מעשה נסים הקב"ה עושה עם האדם הזה, האדם שהוא נתון באמבטי יום אחד נפשו מקנטה עליו, והתינוק נתון במעי אמו ט' חדשים ואין נפשו קניטה עליו,

למה? שהקב"ה עושה עמו מעשה נסים, [ועל זה (השוה ת' הישן)]
אמר איוב, "אשא דעי למרחוק", והיה איוב [רואה] (ראה) בני
אדם, אשה יולדת איש, והספינה שטה בתוך המים אצבע על
אצבע, ותמה על הדברים האלו, [אמר] (ואומר) "אשא דעי למרחוק
ולפועלי אתן אדק".

(See also the statements of R. Meir and R. Aybu ad loc.,
on the miraculous nature of the embryo).

2. Cf Lev. R. 14:9 (ed. Marg. pp. 314-317); also GR

14:5 (ed. T-A, p. 129, for parallels): כשם:
שצורתו של אדם בעולם הזה, כך צורתו בעולם הבא. בעולם הזה
מתחיל העור ובשר וגומר בגידים ועצמות, אף לעתיד לבוא
מתחיל בעור ובשר וגומר בגידים ועצמות, שכן איוב אומר
"זכר נא כי כהומר עשיתני וגו'". "הלא כחלב התכתני" אין
כתיב כאן, אלא "תתיכני", "וכגבינה הקפאתני" אין כתיב כאן,
אלא "תקפיאני", "עור ובשר הלבשתני" אין כתיב כאן, אלא
"תלבישני", "ובעצמות וגידים סוככתני", אין כתיב כאן, אלא
"תסוככני". "חיים וחסד עשית עמדי וגו'", [אום] (אם) של אשה
לעולם מלא דם עומד וממנו יוצא למקור נידתה, וברצונו של
הקב"ה הולכת טיפה של [לבנונית] (לבנות) ונופלת לתוכו מיד
החלד נוצר. משל לחלב שנתן בקערה, אם נותן לתוכו מסו נקפא
ועומד, ואם לאו הולך רופף.

3. Cf Nid. 25a; also Lev. R. loc. cit., 8 (ed. Marg.

p. 312, for parallels): תני ר' חייא: מרוחקין זה מזה, שני
חוטמין כשתי טיפים של זבוב; תני ר' חייא: ומקורבין זה לזה,
ופיו מתוח כחוט השערה וגוייתו כעדשה - ואם היתה נקבה, גוייתה
(ע"ן ויק'ר, מהד' מרגליות שם) כשעורה לארכה - וחתוך ידיים
ורגלים אין לו, ועליו מפורש בקבלה "הלא כחלב תתיכני וכגבינה
תקפיאני עור ובשר תלבישני" [ועצמות] (ובעצמות) וגידים תסוככני
חיים וחסד עשית עמדי ופקודתך שמרה רוחי".

4. וא"ל אנטונינוס לרבי: נשמה מאימתי ניתנה באדם, משעת
פקידה או משעת יצירה? א"ל: משעת יצירה. א"ל: אפשר חתיכה

של בטר עונדת שלשה ימים בלא מלה ואינה מסרחת? אלא משעת
פקידה. אמר רבי: דבר זה למדני אנטונינוס ומקרא כסייעו,
(on the expression שואמר "ופקודתך שמרה רוהי".
, cf Rashi ad loc., referring to Nid. 16b).

5. Cf Lev. 14:4, and the parallels cited by Margulies
ad loc., p. 306: ר' אליעזר אומר: כשם שיש דלתות לבית, כך
יש דלתות לאשה, הה'ד "כי לא סגר דלתי בטני".

5a. See above, p. 207.

6. See also Jellinek, BHM I, p. 153ff (also p. xxvii);
see further, "The Chronicles of Jerahmeel", x (trans. M.
Gaster, "Oriental Translation fund", NS IV (1899), p. 19ff;
see also his observations ad loc., p. lxiif).

7. Cf Ex. R. 40:3 (also Tanh. OV Ki-Thissa 12), where
this notion is read into God's question to Job, איפה היית
מהו "איפה"? אמר ר'ש לקיש: אמר לו (38:4) ביסדי ארץ?
הקב'ה "אמור לי, האיפה שלך באיזה מקום (=בגופו של אדם
הראשון) היתה תלויה?.....".

(See further Ginzberg op. cit., p. 75, note 10).

8. On this verse, see Ex. R. 28:6; Tanh. OV Yithro 11;
PRE 41.

9. Cf Berakh. 58a: "לך ה' הגדולה (דה'י א, כ'ט 11)", זו
מעשה בראשית, וכך הוא אומר "עושה גדולות עד אין חקר".....

Jellinek's text reads עושה גדולות ואין חקר (Job 5:9). It
is to be noted, however, that this verse is also equated in
our sources with מעשה בראשית (cf GR 13:4, ed. T-A, p. 115):

א'ר הושעי' : קטה היא גבורת גשמים ששקולה כנגד כל מעשה
בראשית, מ'ט? „עושה גדלות ואין חקר וגו'.....", במה?
„הנותן מטר על פני ארץ ושולח מים על פני חוצות (איוב
שם 10)“

verses has obviously led to some confusion in our sources.

In the above passage, 5:9 (ואין חקר) is clearly intended
in view of the continuation in verse 10. However, MSS

London, Paris, Oxford 1 and Munich, all read עד אין חקר
(see also Ta'an. 9b, where this same confusion of verses
occurs again). Consequently, it is difficult to

determine with certainty which verse is intended in the
sources dealing with יצירת הולד. However, in view of
the cosmogonic context in which it occurs, it is probable
that the same significance was attached to 9:10 as to 5:9.

For a further exposition of 9:10 in connection with the

- דרש ר' הנינא: 31a: Nid. „עושה גדלות עד אין חקר ונפלאות עד אין
בר פפא: מאי דכתיב „עושה גדלות עד אין חקר ונפלאות עד אין
מספר“? בא וראה שלא כמדת הקב"ה מדת בשר ודם, מדת בשר ודם
נותן חפץ בחמת צרורה ופיה למעלה, ספק משתמר, ספק אינו
משתמר, ואילו הקב"ה, צר העובר במעי אשה פתוחה ופיה למטה
ומשתמר.

10. See above, p. 191f, and particularly notes 13f ad
loc., for the relevant sources.

11. Cf Nid. 30b; also Yalkut Job 916; 'Asereth ha-
Dibb'roth, Jellinek op. cit., p. 79; Mayan Gannim on
Job ad loc., ed. Buber, p. 91. In connection with the
anatomical material mentioned in this passage, see the

sources cited in note 3 above.

12. This rendering of 29:4, is suggested in the following passage based on the same three verses from Job. The moist condition of the child within its mother's womb is compared to the soil dampened and bedaubed by the winter rains, hence Job recalls this period of his existence as ימי חרפי, "my winter-days" (cf Tanh. B. III, p. 32, see also Buber ad loc. for comments and parallels; also Mayan Gannim, p. 90-91):

זש'ה ״מי יתנני״: הפסוק הזה איוב אמרו כשבאו כירחי קדם כימי קלוח ישמרני״: עליו היסורין, אמר ״מי יתנני כירחי קדם״ - ולואי היו לי הימים שהיו לי כשהייתי במעי אמי. ״כימי קלוח ישמרני״ - מלמד שהתינוק משתמר כשהוא במעי אמו. ״בהלו נדו על ראשי״ - מכאן את למד שאורה לתינוק במעי אמו. ״כאשר הייתי בימי חרפי בסוד קלוח עלי אהלי״ - מדבר בתינוק, כשם שהגשמים טחים בקרקע ומלכלכים אותו, כך התינוק מלוכלך במעי אמו, וכשם שהתינוק עומד מלוכלך, כך אדם מלוכלך בעונות והצרות באות עליו, אותה שעה אמר ״מי יתנני כירחי קדם״ - ולואי היו לי הימים שהייתי במעי אמי. מהו אומר באחרונה? ״כאשר הייתי בימי חרפי״, אמר ר' אבהו: התינוק יוצא ממעי אמו מלא רירין ומלא דם, והכל משבהין ומחבבין אותו וביותר כשהוא זכר, הוי ״אשה כי תזריע וילדה זכר (ויקרא י' ב 2)״.

(The phrase כשם שהגשמים טחים above is corrupt in all the sources cited. Tanh. B. reads כשם שהגשמים טורחת; Tanh. OV, מוחה; Mayan Gannim, טחחות. We have based our emendation upon terminology actually employed in connection with the embryo, cf Nid. 24a, בפניו טוחות, "where the face is covered with viscid matter").

13. The notion of the birth of cosmic elements occurs also in rabbinic sources, cf Ex. R. 15:22, where water, air and fire are given as the three primordial elements, which in turn conceived and bore further elements.
14. Cf Lev. R. 14:4; also Yalkut Job 923; Mayan Gannim p. 123. We may note, however, that at least one of these verses was associated with the embryo already in a tannaitic source, cf Tosephta Berakh. 2:15, ed. Zucker., p. 5, on verse 9; see further PT Nid. iii, 50d.
15. Possibly בגיחו has been taken as גיח = גיא, cf Matnoth Kehunah ad loc.. Alternatively, בגיחו has been associated with גח = גה, "to swell" or "to bulge". Luria ad loc. suggests that בגאון is the basis for the midrashic comment, and not בגיחו.
16. So MS London. Although missing in a number of MSS (see ed. Margulies ad loc., p. 307) and printed editions, it is preferable, as it accounts for each expression in the proof-text.
17. So MS Oxford; printed editions read בעון גללך.
18. See above, note 9 end.
19. Cf Lev. R. 14:3; also Yalkut Tazri'a 547, and Job 905; see further Tanh. B. III, p. 34 (OV Tazri'a 3):
הה' ד"חיים וחסד עשית עמדי ופקודתך שמרה רוחי": ר' אבא בר כהנא אמר תלת, בנוהג שבעולם אם נוטל אדם ארנקי של מעות

ונותן הפה למטה אין המעות מתפוררות? והולד שרוי במעי אמו
והקב'ה משמרו שלא יכול וימות, אין זה שבח? הוי "חיים וחסד
עשית עמדי".....

אמר ר' אלעזר: אם ישהה אדם בקמין שעה אחת אינו מת? ומעיה
של אשה מרותחין והולד נמוך במוך מעיה והקב'ה משמרו שלא
יעשה שפיר, ושלא יעשה שליא, ושלא יעשה סנדל, ואין זה
חיים וחסד, הוי "חיים וחסד עשית עמדי".

אמר ר' תחליפא (ד) קסרי"א: אם אכל אדם פרוסה אחר פרוסה, לא
שניה דוחה את הראשונה? האשה הזו כמה מאכל היא אוכלת וכמה
משקים היא שותה ואינו דוחה הולד, אין זה חיים וחסד?

The reading ר' אלעזר is supported by MSS London and
Vatican. For חמין in printed editions, we have adopted
the reading קמין = KAMINOS, an oven, cf Margulies ad loc.
p. 304; also Buber, Tanhuma ad loc..

20. Cf Lev. R. 14:2; also Yalkut Tazri'a 547; see also
Bacher, "Agada der paläst. Amor." III (part 1), p. 110,
note 4, who suggests that R. Levi's three statements are
an elaboration of R. Aha's comment on Job 36:3.

21. Cf Margulies ad loc., p. 301; also Jastrow,
Dictionary p. 691. Printed editions read לכלוכית.

22. See above, Additional Note I, p. 243f.

23. According to Saturninus, "marriage and generation
are from Satan (xxiv, 2; see Grant, "Gnostic Anthology",
p. 32). A similar notion is expressed in the Gospel of
the Egyptians, according to which the Saviour "came to
destroy the works of the female", viz. bringing marriage

and reproduction to an end (cf Grant, "Gnosticism and Early Christianity", p. 106-107). As is well known, Marcion in particular held the body, sex and marriage in utter contempt, despising procreation (cf Tertullian, "Against Marcion", Book I, xxiv and xxix).

CHAPTER FOUR: THE MYTHICAL MONSTERS, BEHEMOTH, LEVIATHAN
AND ZIZ

I. General Observations

Chapters 40 and 41 of the Book of Job, noted for the mythological elements they contain relating to the Behemoth and Leviathan, offered an obvious scriptural basis for a number of Aggadoth relating to these legendary beasts which were current in talmudic times. In their exegesis of these two chapters, the Rabbis have adapted and augmented this mythological material, introducing aggadic elements, a number of which have their origins in high antiquity, emanating from the same store of ancient traditions presupposed by the biblical text. Before proceeding to consider this material at length, it is necessary to comment on an enigmatic tradition linking the Behemoth and Leviathan with one of the characters in the Book of Job, for which there is no basis either in the biblical text, or in its aggadic exegesis as preserved in existing sources.

Elihu emerges in the Aggadah as an obscure and problematic figure. Already in tannaitic times, Elihu's virtues and character were the subject of some disagreement. While R. Eleazar b. Azariah identified Elihu with the patriarch Isaac, R. Akiba asserted that he

is none other than the blasphemous Balaam.¹ Cryptic allusions were found in Elihu's speeches, suggesting that a number of aggadic traditions had accumulated about this personality, of which only fragments remain.² One of these obscure traditions is preserved in a statement of the later Amora, R. Berechiah, who names Elihu, along with Ezekiel, as one destined to reveal certain Divine mysteries first disclosed at Sinai:-

"R. Berechiah said: It is written,	ר' ברכיה אמר:
(Deut. 5:13), ³ ויגד לכם את ברייתו	כתיב "ויגד לכם ברייתו" - ויגד
which means, 'He told you the Book	לכם את ספר
of Genesis which records the	בראשית שהוא
beginning of the creation of the	תחלת ברייתו
world'... Moreover, whence shall	של עולם....
Elihu come (i.e. whence will he	וכי מניין יבא
derive his information) to reveal	אליהוא בן
to Israel the secrets of the Behe-	ברכאל הבורי ויגלה
moth and Leviathan? Similarly,	לישראל חדריו
whence will Ezekiel come to reveal	בהמות ולויתן?
to them the secrets of the	ומניין יבא יחזקאל
Merkabhah? also from Sinai!	ויגלה להם חדריו
Because it is written, הביאני המלך	מרכבה? אלא הה'ר
'The King admitted me to	"הביאני המלך
His secrets' (Canticles	חדריו".
1;4)." ⁴	

In coupling the name of Elihu with that of

Ezekiel, and in offering no justification for his assertions, R. Berechiah evidently regarded the traditions relating to both these personalities as well known. However, unlike the association between Ezekiel and מעשה מרכבה, the biblical basis for which is well known, the speeches of Elihu (Job 32-37) contain no allusion to the Behemoth and Leviathan, which might suggest some association in rabbinic thought between Elihu and these mythical monsters. It is possible that R. Berechiah's statement presupposes a tradition that Elihu wrote the remaining eleven chapters of the Book of Job. The fact that chapter 31 terminates with the postscript, תמו דברי איוב, may have given rise to the view that Elihu, whose speeches follow immediately, was responsible for the completion of the book as a whole.⁵ However, in view of the parallel expressions, חדר and חדר' בהמות ולויתן, we cannot discount the possibility that just as there was a Baraita devoted to the subject of מעשה מרכבה, so a similar compilation may have existed containing material relating to the mythical monsters, Behemoth, Leviathan and Ziz.

While talmudic-midrashic literature provides us with no further information regarding the association of Elihu with the mythical monsters, there is one non-rabbinic source which suggests some relationship between the Leviathan and Elihu. As we have observed above, the

portrayal of Elihu in the pre-Christian Testament of Job, is almost without parallel in the entire corpus of talmudic-midrashic literature. The author of the Testament depicts Elihu as a "wild beast", "a son of darkness, and not of light",⁶ loving the "beauty of the serpent, and the scales of the dragon". The significance of this last quotation is difficult to determine. Was the author of the Testament merely employing a certain type of terminology, which has its parallels in other pseudepigraphic writings,⁷ to describe the forces of evil? Or, in describing Elihu as a devotee of the serpent-dragon, was he aware of some early tradition linking Elihu with the Leviathan? This possibility is not to be entirely discounted, as the author of the Testament himself, refers to certain records relating to Elihu,⁸ indicating the existence of a collection of legends and traditions which had accumulated about this personality in very early times. It is conceivable, therefore, that just as a trace of the older image of Elihu as a daemonic figure survived in rabbinic circles, so some elements of an ancient tradition associating him with the Leviathan, were also preserved. However, as a result of the more favourable view regarding Elihu which prevailed in rabbinic circles,⁹ the older tradition was divested of its sinister associations, and against the background of mystical speculation surrounding the

Behemoth and Leviathan, Elihu emerges as the keeper of these monsters' mysteries.

The mysteries relating to the Behemoth and Leviathan represent only one of the problems arising from the treatment of these mythical creatures in talmudic-midrashic literature. The statements quoted above from the Testament of Job, indicate that the author regarded the Leviathan-Dragon as a symbol of evil. This concept is one of great antiquity, occurring among the earliest recorded traditions of the Semitic peoples.¹⁰ While this concept has its counterpart in early Christian,¹¹ and particularly Gnostic thought,¹² it is notably lacking in older rabbinic sources.¹³ Moreover, in view of the large store of legends and traditions relating to the Behemoth and Leviathan preserved in our sources, it is curious that there are so few allusions to these monsters in tannaitic sources.¹⁴ It is hardly likely that the myths and legends relating to the Behemoth and leviathan owe their origins almost entirely to the amoraic period. Pseudepigraphic literature already contains elements of Aggadoth which occur in later, rabbinic sources, thus indicating that these traditions were current at an early period.¹⁵ Moreover, as we shall show subsequently, a number of Aggadoth which were current in rabbinic circles have their origins in the earliest mythological traditions of the Ancient Near

East. These omissions in talmudic-midrashic literature tend to support our conclusion above, that there once existed a more comprehensive corpus of material - possibly speculative in character - relating to the mythical monsters, which has not survived. We would conjecture further that the speculation which surrounded these monsters bore some resemblance to Gnostic thought, which not only preserves the sinister associations of the Leviathan, but also allots this creature a cosmogonic role. Consequently, הַדָּרִי בַּהֶמוֹת וּלְוִיָּתָן may have been involved in some way with the more general speculative subject of מַעֲשֵׂה בְּרֵאשִׁית.¹⁶ As such, Behemoth-Leviathan mysteries would have been subject to the same proscriptions imposed upon other speculative studies, which would account for the deficiency of material in our sources.

It is possible, however, that at least one element of the speculative notions surrounding the Leviathan, has been preserved in our sources in association with a verse from the Book of Job. The Testament of Job refers, in a passage quoted earlier, to the "beauty of the serpent and the scales of the dragon". Although the full implications of these words remain obscure, they do indicate that some special significance may have been attached to the appearance of the Leviathan at an early period. It is interesting to note, therefore,

that the extraordinary nature of the Leviathan's skin is mentioned in rabbinic Aggadah. According to two later Amoraim, the dazzling quality of the Leviathan's fins

alone could dim the light of the sun:¹⁷
הרי עורו של לוייתן:¹⁷
שאני עתיד לעשות לבדיקים לעתיד לבוא, אם מחסר אני מטליה
אחד ממנו יש לי למלאות, שנאמר „התמלא בשכות עורו". ואם
תאמר עורו של לוייתן אינו דבר משובח, אמר ר' פנחס הכהן
בן חמא ור' ירמיה בשם ר' שמואל ב'ר יצחק: חדודות שלו
מכהות גלגל חמה, שנאמר „תחתיו חדודי חרש", ואין „חרש"
אלא שמש, שנאמר „האומר לחרס ולא יזרח".

("Behold the skin of the Leviathan which I am to use for the righteous in the hereafter, if I were to omit a single patch from it, I would be obliged to make it good, as it is said, 'Can you make good its skin with patches'¹⁸ (Job 40:31)?'. Should you say that the skin of the Leviathan is nothing remarkable, R. Pinhas ha-Kohen b. Hama and R. Jeremiah in the name of R. Shemuel b. Isaac said: Even its fins¹⁹ could dim the light of the sun! as it is said, 'Beneath him are sun-like fins (ibid. 41:22)', for חרש means the 'sun', as it is said, 'Who commands the sun - חרס - and it rises not (ibid., 9:7)'").

It is significant that the two Amoraim above attribute to the Leviathan a quality associated in talmudic-midrashic sources with the Primordial Light, which, according to very early traditions, surpassed the natural luminaries in its brilliance.²⁰ This parallel is by no means a coincidence, but can be borne out by further examples. According to the well-known Aggadah

cited earlier, the Primordial Light was stored away so that it might shine forth upon the righteous in the hereafter.²¹ A strikingly similar notion is expressed by an unknown Aggadist, who propounds the view that the radiant light which will illuminate the world at the end of days, will emanate from the hide of the Leviathan which will be extended over the city of Jerusalem.²² While it is possible that these notions have their origins in the context of the legends relating to the Primordial Light, and were incorporated subsequently into the Leviathan myths, it is to be noted that the luminous qualities of the Leviathan are referred to at an early period, in one of the very few sources relating to the Leviathan which have survived from the tannaitic period. The early Tanna, R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, cites Job 41:10 to support the notion that the Leviathan emits a great light from its eyes:

מעשה ברבי אליעזר ורבי יהושע שהיו באין בספינה, והיה ר' אליעזר ישן ור' יהושע נעור. נודעו ר' יהושע וננער ר' אליעזר, א'ל: מה זה יהושע, מפני מה נודעו? א'ל: מאור גדול ראיתי בים. א'ל: שמא עיניו של לויתן ראית, דכתיב "עיניו כעפעפי שחר".²³

In the absence of any further material of this nature, the value and significance of these sources cannot be fully assessed. Nonetheless we may assume that this notion, possibly of high antiquity, that the Leviathan was a source of supernatural light, comparable with that created by God at the outset of the creation,

may have some place in a wider complex of mystical concepts and ideas.

II. The Physical Features of the Behemoth and Leviathan

The majority of the Aggadoth relating to the Behemoth and Leviathan preserved in our sources, deal with their dimensions and their eschatological role. Many of these aggadic notions have been associated with verses from the Book of Job, in one or two cases, the same proof-text being employed as the basis for opposing views. R. Johanan b. Nappaha and his colleagues both support their conflicting opinions regarding the diet of the Behemoth with God's utterance in Job 40:20, **כִּי בּוֹל**

הָרִים יִשְׁאוּ לוֹ וְכָל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה יִשְׁחָקוּ שָׁם. On the basis of the first clause of this verse, R. Johanan propounded the view that the Behemoth is a vegetarian, consuming the produce of a thousand hills. The Rabbis on the other hand, taking the second clause as explicative of the first, assert that, although the Behemoth is a member of the bovine family, it is, nonetheless, a carnivorous beast:

בהמה אחת מסרתי לך ולא היית יכול לעמוד בה, ואיזו
זו? "בהמות בהררי אלף (תה' נ' 10) "... ר' יוחנן אמר:
בהמה אחת רבוצה על אלף הרים ואלף הרים מגדלין לה מזונות,
שנ' "כי בול הרים ישאו לו".... ורבנן אמרי: בהמה אחת
רבוצה על אלף הרים וכולן מגדלין לה בהמות והיא אוכלת, שנ'
"וכל חית השדה ישחקו שם". ואיפשר כן? אית בעיר אכיל בעיר?
א'ר תנהומא: גדולים מעשי אלקינו, ומשונים מעשיו עד מאוד. 24

The above passage is followed in our sources by a further difference of opinion, based once again on the same proof-text, Job 40:23, from which R. Joshua b. Levi and his colleagues sought to deduce their conflicting views regarding the Behemoth's drinking

capacity: ומהיכן הוא שותה? ריב' ל ורבנן פליגי. ריב' ל אמר, כל מה שהירדן מכניס לששה חדשים הוא עושה אותן גמיעה אחת. ומ'ט? משום שנ' "הן יעשוק נהר לא יחפז". ורבנן אמרי: כל מה שהירדן מכניס ל'ב חדשים הוא עושה אותן גמיעה אחת. ומ'ט? שנ' "יבטח כי יגיה ירדן אל פיהו", ויש בהם כדי לכלוך כה, ורב הונא בשם ר' יוסף אמר: אין בהם לכלוך כה. ("Whence does the Behemoth

drink? R. Joshua b. Levi and the Rabbis held differing opinions. R. Joshua b. Levi said: All the water which the Jordan accumulates in six months, he consumes in a single mouth-full! What is the scriptural basis for this? הן יעשוק נהר לא יחפז (יבטח כי יגיה ירדן אל פיהו). The Rabbis said: All that the Jordan accumulates in twelve months, he consumes in a single mouth-full! What is the scriptural basis for this? יבטח כי יגיה ירדן אל פיהו. And they are sufficient to moisten his mouth. R. Huna said in the name of R. Joseph: They are not sufficient even to moisten his mouth!").

We have left the proof-text untranslated above, as the precise relationship between Job 40:23 and the views expressed in this passage, is difficult to determine, as can be seen from the attempts of the commentators in the standard texts. We may note, however,

that clause B of Job 40:23, appears only in the Pesikta as the basis of both opinions recorded in this passage. In all other sources, clause A alone is cited in connection with R. Joshua's view. We may assume, therefore, that R. Joshua took this phrase to mean, "When the river is violent" - viz. in full flood, indicating that the Behemoth consumes the volume of water produced by the Jordan in the six months of high water. His colleagues, on the other hand, may have found an allusion to the six months of the Jordan's low ebb in the expression ירדן itself. Unless it occurs with adverbial force (e.g. ירדן ירחו), this noun is never employed without the definite article in the absolute form, except in Job 40:23. Consequently, R. Joshua's colleagues may have taken this deficiency of the grammatical form to indicate a similar deficiency in the Jordan's ebb.²⁵

From its context, Job 40:23 is clearly a description of the Behemoth. However, in a Baraita preserved in Babha Bathra 74b, this same verse is interpreted with reference to the Leviathan: ירדן יוצא ממערת פמ"ס ומהלך בימה של סיבכי ובימה של סבריא ובימה של סדום,²⁶ ומתגלגל ויורד לים הגדול, ומתגלגל ויורד עד שמגיע לפיו של לוייתן, שנ' "יבטח כי יגיה ירדן אל פיהו". מתקיף לה רבא בר עולא: האי בבהמות בהררי אלף כתיב, אלא אמר רבא בר עולא: אימתי בהמות בהררי אלף בטוחות? בזמן שמגיה ירדן בפיו של לוייתן. ("The Jordan issues

forth from the Cavern of Paneas, proceeds to the seas of Sibkhay, Tiberias and Sodom, then it roars and descends.

to the Great Sea, continuing until it reaches the mouth of the Leviathan, as it is said, 'He is confident that the Jordan will reach his mouth'.²⁷ Rabha b. 'Ulla raised an objection against this application of the verse.

'This verse is written with reference to the Behemoth upon a thousand hills! But - said Rabha b. 'Ulla - when does the Behemoth upon a thousand hills feel secure (viz. to drink himself)? When the Jordan rushes forth into the mouth of the Leviathan.'").

From the continuation of the text of the Talmud which we have included above, we see that the Amora, Rabha b. 'Ulla was already disturbed by the unusual application of Job 40:23 to the Leviathan, and was obliged to place a rather forced interpretation upon the verse in order to justify the Baraita. Obviously, the anonymous author of the Baraita was aware of the context in which this verse occurs. It is possible, therefore, that his interpretation of his proof-text reflects a tradition contrary to that generally accepted in rabbinic sources. Both Palestinian and Babylonian sources refer to female partners of the Behemoth and Leviathan, but, contrary to Gunkel's assertions, nowhere in rabbinic literature do we find any explicit evidence for the notion that these two monsters were a mated pair. However, that such a notion had been developed in early times, is evident in pseudepigraphic literature where the

Leviathan is conceived as the female, and the Behemoth as the male. Possibly the unknown Tanna cited above was aware of this tradition that the two monsters constituted a pair, consequently he regarded Job 40:23 as applicable to either beast.²⁸

A particularly graphic description of the Leviathan's eating and drinking habits is given by R. Johanan b. Nappaha on the basis of two further verses from the Book of Job. In 41:23-24, R. Johanan found allusions to the devastating methods by which the Leviathan obtains its food and drink, searing the waters with its flaming breath, at the same time perfuming the ocean with the fragrance of Paradise. In its efforts to quench its gigantic thirst, the Leviathan uncovers the sea-bed itself, leaving the ocean's resources depleted for many decades:²⁹

בשעה שלויתן רעב מוציא הבל מפיו ומרתיה כל מימות שבמצולה, שנ' "ירתיה כסיר מצולה", ואלמלא מכניס ראשו לגן עדן אין כל בריה יכולה לעמוד בריחו, שנ' "ים ישים כמרקחה",³⁰ ובשעה שצמא עושה תלמים תלמים בים שנ' "אחריו יאיר נתיב".³¹ אמר רב אחא בר יעקב: אין תהום חוזר לאיתנו עד שבעים שנה, שנ' "יחשוב תהום לשיבה" - ואין "שיבה" פתוחה משבעים.

We conclude this particular aspect of the Leviathan legends with one further exposition of a verse from Job, which is of some exegetical interest. The basic meaning of the verb חטא - "to miss", viz. a mark or target, hence "to err" - is well known. In Job 41:17,

this verb occurs in the hithpa'el, מִשְׁבְּרִים יִתְחַטְּאוּ. An unknown teacher, for the purposes of his Aggadah, has invested this unusual form with a meaning quite the opposite to the normal connotations of this verb. As חָטָא occurs in Judges 20:16, in the context of going directly towards a target, so יִתְחַטְּאוּ may be taken as synonymous with יִתְכַּחֲנוּ, "to direct oneself", or "to go directly":³² מה "מִשְׁבְּרִים יִתְחַטְּאוּ"? לומר לך כשהוא מבקש לאכול, הוא מקיש בזנבו ועושה שבר בים, והדגים מתכחניין ובאין שם, והוא אוכל, ואין "יִתְחַטְּאוּ" אלא כחונה, שנאמר "קולע באבן אל השערה ולא יחטיא". (What does מִשְׁבְּרִים יִתְחַטְּאוּ imply?)

³³ imply? It is to inform you that when the Leviathan wishes to eat, it beats with its tail, making a cleft in the sea, and the fishes come directly there and he eats them, for יִתְחַטְּאוּ connotes to go directly towards a mark, as it is said, 'Every one could sling stones at a hair-breadth and not miss (Judges 20:16).'.).

III. The Conflict with the Leviathan

Rabbinic traditions relating to the conflict with the Leviathan are well known. However, little attempt has been made to evaluate these traditions against the background of ancient near-eastern mythology where the conflict with the dragon, as Gaster has shown, is a widely recurring theme of great antiquity. In his detailed analysis of this subject, Gaster has allotted a place to rabbinic legends in the general development of

34
this myth, however, his remarks are cursory and his observations incomplete. Consequently, a more detailed analysis of the relevant material is still required. Moreover, no serious attempt has been made to assess the relationship between rabbinic mythology and the supposedly older biblical traditions. As we have observed elsewhere,³⁵ rabbinic traditions have occasionally preserved some elements of an ancient myth in greater detail than biblical sources, which the Rabbis have augmented by means of their aggadic exegesis, reintroducing mythological elements which the biblical author was no doubt anxious to omit. This is best illustrated by the rabbinic exposition of Job 41:7 and 17ff. The biblical passage itself is merely a description of the Leviathan's invincibility. There is no overt reference to an actual conflict, nor is there any allusion to a particular setting, either cosmogonic or eschatological. However, certain significant expressions which the author has employed, and particularly his allusion to the terror of the gods at the presence of the Leviathan (verse 17), which clearly echoes the ancient combat myth as preserved in both Accadian and Ugaritic texts, leave little doubt regarding the context from which he has taken his imagery.³⁶ The treatment of this passage in rabbinic sources is an interesting one. Although the grosser, polytheistic implications of verse 17 are toned down, the terrified gods being transformed into angels,³⁷ the passage is

considerably dramatised. An unknown Aggadist in his exegesis of the biblical text, has introduced a number of early legendary elements, thereby reconstructing the

ancient combat myth:³⁸ "גאווה אפיקי מגנים", שיש לו גאווה של מעלה, והקב"ה אומר למלאכי השרת: רדו ועשו עמו מלחמה. מיד יורדין ועושין עמו מלחמה ולויתן תולה פניו ומלאכי השרת רואין אותו ומתבהלין מיראתו ובורחין, שנ' "משאתו יגורו אלים" - ואין "אליס" אלא מלאכי השרת, שנ' "מי בשחק יערוך לה" ידמה לה' בבני אליס?" והקב"ה אומר למלאכים: סלו חרבות ורדו עליו. מיד נוטלין חרבות ונותנים עליו ולא איכפת ליה,³⁹ שנ' "משיגהו חרב בלי תקום חנית מסע ושריה", כשם שהחנית הזה בורח מן השריון, כך היא בורחת מעורו של לויתן, והברזל חשוב לו כתבן, שנ' "יחשוב לתבן ברזל לעץ רקבון נחושה", הם נוטלין עליו קשתות ומורים עליו חצים ולא איכפת ליה⁴⁰ שנ' "לא יבריחנו בן קשת", והם נוטלין אבני קלע וזורקין עליו והוא סבור שהן כקש, שנ' "לקש נהפכו לו אבני קלע כקש נחשבו תותח" מה הקב"ה עושה? מביא בהמות ולויתן והם עושים מלחמה זה עם זה, שנ' "אחד באחד יגשו ורוח לא יבא ביניהם" - אל תקרא "ורוח" אלא "ורוח". ד'א "ורוח לא יבא ביניהם", אלו מלאכי השרת שנקראו "רוחות", שנ' "עושה מלאכיו רוחות". מיד בהמות ולויתן מדבקים זה עם זה, שנ' "איש באחיהו ידבקו", ומשהם מדבקים זה עם זה אינן מתפרשין מזה, שנ' "יתלכדו ולא יתפרדו", מה הקב"ה עושה? רומז ללויתן, והוא מכה את הבהמות בחנפיריו ושוחטו, ורומז לבהמות והוא מכה ללויתן בזנבו וממיתו מיד.

("On account of its arrogance, He brings forth His armed ones⁴¹ (Job 41:7)': because the Leviathan possesses a celestial pride, God says to the ministering angels: Go down and wage war with it! Whereupon they descend and wage war with it. But the Leviathan rears its head, and when the angels see it, they are afraid of its terror and

flee, as it is said, 'At its raising itself up, the angels are terrified (ibid., verse 17)', מַלְאָכָא means 'ministering angels', as it is said, 'For who in the skies can be compared unto the Lord? who among the angels is like unto the Lord? (Ps. 89:7)'..... Then God says to the angels: Take up swords and go down against it! Thereupon, they take up swords and set upon it, but it does not affect the Leviathan, as it is said, 'Though they overtake him with the sword, it will not hold (Job ibid., 18)'; הִנֵּיתָ מִסַּע וְשִׁרְיָה (ibid.: 'he diverts the spear as chain-mail'),⁴² just as a spear is diverted from chain-mail, so it is diverted from the hide of the Leviathan! Moreover, iron weapons are accounted by it as straw, as it is said, 'He regards iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood (ibid., verse 19)'. They take up bows and shoot arrows at it, but it does not affect the Leviathan, as it is said, 'The arrow cannot make him flee (ibid., verse 20)'. Then they take up sling-stones and cast them at it, but the Leviathan regards them as stubble, as it is said, 'Sling-stones are turned with him into stubble (ibid.)'..... What does God do then? He brings together the Behemoth and the Leviathan, and they do battle with one another, as it is said, 'They draw near to one another, and there is no open space between them (viz. they are closely interlocked; ibid., verse 8)' - reading וְלֹא יִהְיֶה רוּחַ בֵּינָם not וְלֹא יִהְיֶה רוּחַ. Alternatively, וְלֹא יִהְיֶה רוּחַ

מַלְאָכַי הַקֹּדֶשׁ, refers to the ministering angels who are called רִחוּם, 'spirits', as it is said, 'Who makes His angels spirits' (Ps. 104:4)⁴³. Immediately the Behemoth and Leviathan cleave to one another, as it is said, 'They are joined one to the other (Job ibid., 9)', and once they are joined together, they do not separate from one another, as it is said, 'They stick together that they cannot be sundered (ibid.)'. What does God do? He signals to the Leviathan, and it smites the Behemoth with its fins and slaughters it, and He signals to the Behemoth who smites the Leviathan with its tail and kills it!"⁴⁴.

The conflict between the Behemoth and the Leviathan with which this passage concludes, does not belong to the older legend of the combat with the Leviathan. This Aggadah is of a much later date, and is, presumably, a reflection of the conditions prevailing in Palestine under Roman rule. It is explicitly stated in the parallel passage,⁴⁵ that this spectacle of the great beasts in conflict is reserved particularly for those who resisted the temptations of the arena, and in all probability, it was the beast-fights of the arena which inspired this type of imagery. Rabbinic sources, however, do preserve other traditions relating to the fate of the Leviathan which resemble more closely the earliest mythological accounts of this beast. In the Sumerian version, Asag, the dragon, is imprisoned beneath a heap

of stones. This notion is echoed in Greek mythology where Tryphon is held captive beneath Mt. Etna.⁴⁶ This same tradition, we would suggest, is reflected in the rabbinic interpretation of the obscure phrase, סגור חזק צר (Job 41:17). According to the Amora, R. Berechiah, these words are God's declaration that He has safely and securely immured the Leviathan,⁴⁷ אמר הקב"ה: סגרתי עליו והחמתי עליו והצרתי עליו.

Rabbinic sources preserve a further account of the defeat and the destruction of the Leviathan - once again in connection with verses from the Book of Job - which may also reflect the ancient combat-myth. According to R. Johanan b. Nappaha, the angel Gabriel is destined to engage the Leviathan in mortal combat. However, he will not be able to destroy the Leviathan until God will intervene and render his weapon effective against the beast:⁴⁸ עתיד גבריאל לעשות קניגיא אם לויתן שנ' "התמשך לויתן בחכה ובחבל תשקיע לשונו (איוב מ' 25)", ואלמלא הקב"ה עוזרו אין יכול לו "העושו יגש חרב" (שם, 19).⁴⁹

We may observe initially that R. Johanan's Aggadah is contrary to biblical sources, where God Himself is consistently depicted as the sole conquerer of the Leviathan.⁵⁰ On the other hand, R. Johanan's imagery does have its parallel in the polytheistic versions of the ancient myth. In all the accounts of the early legend cited by Gaster, the Dragon is subdued by a divine hero supported in his task by another deity or deities, who

usually furnish him with an effective weapon.⁵¹ The biblical version of this myth has obviously been adapted under the influence of Israelite monotheism. The divine supporters are understandably eliminated, so that the Hebrew God emerged as the sole hero of the exploit. Rabbinic legend, however, has retained the more original form of the ancient myth. The combination of a divine hero and his supporting deity who ensures the effectiveness of the combatant's weapons, is preserved, although translated into acceptable terms. As with the terrified gods in an earlier passage,⁵² the divine hero becomes an angel, the supporting deity being God Himself, who enables Gabriel's sword to vanquish the beast.

IV. The Messianic Role of the Leviathan

Two verses in particular from the Book of Job have been associated with the Leviathan's messianic role, 40:30-31, יָכֵרוּ עָלָיו חֲבָרִים יַחְצֹוּהוּ בֵּין כְּנָעִים הַתְּמָלָא בְּשָׁכוֹת עוֹרָו וְנִצְלָצַל דְּגִים רָאשׁוֹ. While the general application of these verses in our sources is similar, it is interesting to note the variations in the exegesis of certain expressions. According to R. Johanan b. Nappaha, the expression חֲבָרִים in the first of these verses, is an allusion to the scholars (= חֲבָרִים), who will be privileged to partake of the Leviathan's flesh in the hereafter:⁵³ עֵתִיד הַקֶּבֶה לַעֲשׂוֹת סְעוּדָה לַצַּדִּיקִים מִבְּשָׂרוֹ

של לוייתן, שנ' "יכרו עליו חברים", ואין כרה אלא סעודה, שנ' "ויכרה להם כרה גדולה ויאכלו וישתו", ואין חברים אלא תלמידי חכמים, שנ' "היושבת בגנים חברים מקשיבים לקולך הטמיעני", והשאר מחלקין אותו ועושין בו סחורה בשוקי ירושלים, שנ' "המנוחה בין כנענים", ואין כנענים אלא תגרים, שנאמר "כנען בידו מאזני מרמה לעשק אהב".

("In future, God is to make a feast from the flesh of the Leviathan, as it is said, 'The scholars shall feast on it (Job 40:30)', for כרה means feasting, as it is said, 'And he prepared for them a great feast, and they ate and they drank (II Kings 6:23)', moreover, חברים means 'the scholars', as it is said, 'Thou that dwellest in the gardens, the scholars hearken to thy voice' (Cant. 8:13)'). As for the remains, they shall divide them up and use them for merchandise in the markets of Jerusalem, as it is said, 'they shall divide among the merchants (Job. ibid.)', for כנענים means 'merchants', as it is said, 'He is a merchant, the balances of deceit are in his hand, he loveth to oppress (Hos. 12:8)'").

A more elaborate interpretation of this verse has been preserved in our sources, by an anonymous teacher who suggests that the expression חברים connotes חבורות, whole companies of the pious, grouped according to their academic attainments and personal merits. Moreover, the expression כנענים "merchants", is taken as an indication of the orderly fashion in which the righteous will come to receive their desserts:⁵⁵ "יכרו"

עליו הברית", הבורות הבורות, יש בעלי מקרא, יש בעלי משנה,
 יש בעלי תלמוד, יש בעלי הגדה, יש בעלי מצות, יש בעלי
 מעשים טובים, כל חבורה וחבורה באה ונטלה חלקה. ושם תאמר
 יש ביניהם מריבה, תלמוד לומר "יחצוהו בין כנענים" – אלו
 הפרגמטוטי⁵⁶, כשם שהפרגמטוטי⁵⁷ הללו כשיש להם אבן טובה
 בשותפות, והן מוכרין אותה, וכשהן באין לחלוק דמיה אינן
 עושין מריבה, אלא כל אחד בא ונוטל חלקו לפי דמים שנתן,
 כך לעתיד לבא אין ביניהם מריבה, אלא כל אחד ואחד מן
 הצדיקים בא ויטול שכרו לפי מעשיו, לכך "יחצוהו בין
 הכנענים" – ואין כנענים אלא פרגמטוטי⁵⁸, דכתיב "אשר
 סוחריה שרים כנעניה נכבדי ארץ (ישעי' כ"ח 8)".

One further interpretation of verse 30 is
 preserved in our sources in conjunction with verse 31,
 on the basis of which an unusual notion is introduced.
 The expression צלצל is taken as an allusion to a
 celestial symbol which God will sound to summon the
 חברים (viz. those who have "attached themselves" to the
 performance of their religious duties) to partake of the
 choice food which has been reserved for them: מיד⁵⁷
 הקב"ה מה עושה? נוטל עורו של לוי⁵⁸תן ועושה סוכה לצדיקים⁵⁹
 דכתיב "התמלא בסוכות עורו", "ובצלצל דגים ראשו", ר' נחמן
 ור' הונא הכהן ור' יהודה הלוי בר' שלום⁵⁸, אחד מהם אומר:
 מקיש בצלצלו ואומר "כל מי שעשה מצות רגילות, יבא ויאכל
 מראשו" – וטעמו כטעם הראש של דג שבים טבריא. וחברו אומר:
 מקיש בצלצלו ואומר "כל מי שעשה מצות רגילות, יבא ויאכל
 מראשו" – וטעמו כטעם הראש של דג שבים הגדול. מיד הם באים
 ומתחברים עליו, שנאמר "יכרו עליו חברים" – מי שחבר עצמו
 במצות.

A further interpretation of the expression

צלצל in verse 31 is given by R. Johanan b. Nappaha, who associates it with צלצל, a reduplication of צל, "a shade", thus finding an allusion in verses 31 and 29 to the varying marks of distinction to be bestowed upon the pious in keeping with the measure of their merits:

עתיד הקב"ה לעשות סוכה לצדיקים מעורו של לויתן, שנאמר
 "התמלא בסוכות עורו" - זכה, עושין לו סוכה, לא זכה, עושין
 לו צלצל, שנאמר "ובצלצל דגים ראשו", זכה, עושין לו צלצל,
 לא זכה, עושין לו ענק, שנאמר "וענקים לגרורותיך", זכה,
 עושין לו ענק, לא זכה, עושין לו קמיע, שנאמר "ותקשרנו
 לנערוותיך". ("In future God is to make a

pavilion from the skin of the Leviathan, as it is said,
 'Will you fill its skin with booths (verse 31)'. If a man
 is sufficiently meritorious, they will make for him a
 booth, if not, they will make a shade for his head, as it
 is said, 'or a fish-shade (viz. a shade of fishes' skin)
 for his head (ibid.)'. If he is sufficiently meritorious,
 they will make for him a shade, if not, they will make
 for him a chain, as it is said, 'and chains about thy
 neck (Prov. 1:9)⁶⁰'. If he is sufficiently meritorious,
 they will make for him a chain, if not, they will make
 for him an amulet, as it is said, 'and you shall bind it
 about the least among you (Job 40:29)'.⁶¹)".

V. The Monster Bird, Ziz

So far no reference has been made in the above sources to the remaining mythical creature, the Ziz.

Although it forms part of the triad of monsters, representing the creatures of land, sea and air, the Ziz apparently belongs to a separate cycle of legends. For in existing sources, the Ziz is only superficially brought into relationship with the Behemoth and Leviathan. In some sources relating to the consumption of these beasts in the hereafter, the Ziz also appears on the Messianic menu. However, as we observed earlier, this does not exclude the possibility that there was once a corpus of material on the subject of the Behemoth and Leviathan and also the Ziz, in which the relationship between these monsters was a well-developed theme. For, as in the case of the Behemoth and Leviathan, there are some indications in our sources of more extensive material relating to the Ziz which has not survived. Moreover, from one significant parallel quoted below between the Leviathan and Ziz, we may conjecture that other parallel traditions may have accumulated about these creatures, of which no trace has been preserved.

One unusual aspect of the Ziz-legends in talmudic-midrashic literature, is the diversity of the names by which this monster bird was known in talmudic times. As we shall see subsequently, זיז (Job 39:13), and זיז (38:36) were also taken as names or epithets for the Ziz, while in rabbinic sources two further names occur in descriptions of this monster, זיז and זיז.

יִזְיָ, the Targumim employing yet a further epithet for the Ziz, תְּרַנְנֵנִי בְרָא. However, from parallel traditions, and particularly the scriptural proof-texts (predominantly from the Book of Job) upon which these legends are based, we may deduce that, despite the variety of names, the monster referred to in all the sources is essentially the same.⁶³ It is possible that the various names for the Ziz reflect the different sources from which the legends relating to the monster-bird were borrowed. Moreover, the terms רְנָנִים and שְׂכוּי may be no more than aggadic epithets for the Ziz, alluding to a particular function which, as can be seen from the material quoted below, this mythical beast is supposed to perform.

We discussed at length above the tradition that the Leviathan is a source of extraordinary light, capable of dimming the sun with its brilliance. It is interesting to note that a similar notion is expressed by the Amora, R. Judah b. Simon, in connection with the Ziz, on the basis of Job 39:26:⁶⁴ אֲרֵר יְהוּדָה בְּרֵבִי סִימֹן בְּשָׁעָה שֶׁהוּא פּוֹרֵשׁ אֶת כְּנָפָיו מִכָּהָה גִּלְגַּל חֲמָה, הֵהָדֵד הַמְבִינָתָךְ ("R. Judah b. Simon said: When the Ziz spreads out its wings, it dims the sun itself, as it is said, 'Does the Sparkling One soar by your wisdom, which, when it spreads its wings, is like the Southern One (= the sun)?'").⁶⁵

The above rendering of זִיז is based upon the

assumption that R. Judah has associated זִיז with זִיזוֹן "a spark", from the same verbal root, hence, "the Sparkling One". In all probability, this is the meaning of the alternative name for the Ziz found in the Targum to Job (ad loc.), and in Babylonian sources,⁶⁶ זִיז זִיז, which, once again, may be an allusion to its lustrous nature. We would suggest further that this tradition may be presupposed by the name זִיז itself. So far no satisfactory basis has been offered for the widely accepted tradition that the biblical expression זִיז refers to a monster bird.⁶⁷ It is possible, therefore, that the expression זִיז, in the sense of the "Glistening - or - Shining One",⁶⁸ was taken as an epithet for the monster bird whose supernatural light could dim that of the natural luminaries.

We may note in conclusion a tradition relating to the activities of the Ziz which has been preserved mainly in the Targum to Job, and in the Targum to Psalms, which, in Bacher's opinion, may have close affinities.⁶⁹ In its rendering of Psalm 50:11, וְזִיז שִׁיר עֲמָדִי, the Targum adds the following description of the monster bird: וְתִרְנֹגוֹל בִּרְא דְקִרְצוֹלִיָּה שִׁירִין בְּאַרְעָא וְרִישִׁיָּהּ מְטִי בְּשָׁמַיָא ("The Wild Cock whose feet rest upon the earth and whose head reaches into heaven, sings before Me"). Although we find no allusion to the singing of the Ziz in talmudic-midrashic literature, the Targum to Job

refers to this tradition in no less than three of its renderings:

a) כנף רננים נעלסה 39:13: 70

"The wing of the Wild Cock
which lauds and praises
(its Creator)."

גדפא דתרנגול
ברא דמשובחא
ומקלסא.

b) אל תבא רננה בו 3:7:

"Let not the singing of
the Wild Cock with which
it praises, come thereon!"

לא תיעול רננה
דתרנגול ברא
למקלסא ביה.

c) או מי נתן לשכוי בינה 38:36: 71

"Who gave the Wild
Cock understanding to
praise its Master?"

(ת'א) : מן יהב...
לתרנגול ברא ביונתא
למקלסא למריה?

While Ginzberg may be correct in assuming that this concept of the "Heavenly Singer and Seer" ⁷² probably has its origins in Old Iranian mythology, this does not account for the Targumist's knowledge of this tradition. From what source did he derive his interpretation of these verses? Once again we are obliged to assume that our sources are incomplete on the subject of the Ziz, as with the other monsters, Behemoth and Leviathan. Possibly the translator of Job had before him a compilation of Aggadoth, such as we suggested above, containing the

original myths, and/or scriptural expositions relating to them.

VI. Rabbinic Traditions and Ancient Mythology

In conclusion, some consideration must be given in general terms to the antiquity and origins of the rabbinic myths discussed above, and their relationship to the biblical texts with which they have been associated. We have endeavoured to show in this chapter and elsewhere,⁷³ that certain mythological elements which survived into rabbinic times are of high antiquity, emanating from the same store of Ancient-Near Eastern traditions presupposed by the Bible itself. This is particularly evident in the case of the Leviathan, which figures widely in the mythological traditions of the Ancient-Near Eastern cultures of the fertile crescent. The rabbinic traditions relating to this mythological beast represent but one version of a well-established myth, developed under the influence of biblical monotheism and rabbinic messianism, which have largely transformed the Leviathan from an opposing deity, destroyed or vanquished at the time of the creation, into a subordinate creature, destined for destruction in the eschatological age.⁷⁴

The question regarding the antiquity of

rabbinic traditions relating to the Behemoth has not yet been fully discussed. Until very recent times, the biblical Behemoth has generally been identified with a natural, rather than a supernatural creature. Only with the discovery of the Rash Shamra texts, has some evidence come to light which challenges this long-established view, providing a basis for both biblical and rabbinic traditions. The allusions in Ugaritic texts to a "Monstrous Ferocious Bullock" (= $\text{pny } \text{lx } \text{lay}$) who is vanquished along with LOTAN (= ln'ly) by 'Anat, and to the bovine monsters who are released against Baal, suggest the existence in ancient Canaanite mythology of a prototype for the Behemoth in biblical traditions.⁷⁵ These allusions in Ugaritic texts are possibly of greater significance for rabbinic legend, where the supernatural character of the Behemoth was an accepted fact. As can be seen from the material cited earlier in this chapter, rabbinic sources clearly portray this monster as bovine in character, and of a voracious appetite consuming vast quantities of produce. This description is hardly supported by the biblical picture of the Behemoth. Its bovine character is suggested rather than explicitly stated, while no mention is made of its gargantuan appetite. In the Ugaritic texts, however, where the bovine character of this beast is clearly defined, the bull-monsters bear the epithets 'AKLM and 'AQQM, viz.

"eaters" and "devourers", which suggests that they were characterised by an abnormal capacity for consumption.⁷⁶

It is possible, therefore, that rabbinic tradition has been reintroduced by the rabbis by means of their aggadic exegesis.

This observation has its implications also for those traditions preserved in rabbinic sources relating to the remaining mythological creature discussed above, the Ziz. As can be seen from the material cited earlier, the Rabbis were consistent in identifying several, presumably different species of birds in the biblical text (זִיז , רִנְנִים , שְׂכֹרִי) with the one supernatural creature. It is possible that these terms originally connoted natural species of birds, as modern commentators suggest, which the Rabbis have invested with mythological significance. However, in view of the apparent accuracy of rabbinic traditions relating to the Behemoth, it is conceivable that the Rabbis have once again preserved the original implications of these terms, at least in the context of the Book of Job, which is a source rich in mythological material. Unfortunately, this assumption cannot be supported by any external evidence from ancient Palestinian texts. It is to be noted, however, that the rabbinic terms, זִיז and רִנְנִים are of great antiquity, occurring as personal names in Ugaritic texts.⁷⁷ It is possible, therefore, that fresh evidence may yet

come to light which will substantiate the rabbinic interpretation of the above biblical terms.

Notes

1. See above, p. 95 , note 76.
2. See above, p. 35 , note 5, also p. 138.
3. Possibly R. Berechiah saw in the term ויגד, an allusion to some oral information apart from the Written Law, which God communicated to Israel. In medieval sources, הגדה occurs with the meaning of קבלה (cf Maimonides, פירוש המשנה, סנהדרין י' א; הלכות ממרים א' 2), and there is some evidence to suggest that הגדה was employed in the sense of "Oral Tradition" already in talmudic times (cf Lev. R. 18:2, א'ר סימון: מסורת אגדה; see ed. Marg. ad loc., p. 402, where the reading אגדה alone is found; see also p. 150 above, the midrashic comment on the verse ויגד לך תעלומות חכמה וגו' (Job 11:6), where the verb ויגד may once again have been invested with the meaning of imparting oral traditions.
4. Cf Cant. R. to 1:4, also Shir ha-Shirim Zutta, ed. Buber, pp. 11-12. On the expression סדרי מרכבה see also Cant. R. to 1:10, where it is employed by Ben Azzai. Although, in the parallel passage (Lev. R. 16:4), the reading is סדרי מרכבה, however, this is probably an error for סתרי מרכבה, which is presumably an explanation of the more unusual term סתרי (see ed. Marg. ad loc., p. 354, where a number of MSS preserve the reading

חררי). See also Lieberman's essay, "משנת סידר השירים", in Scholem's "Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition", p. 122, although Lieberman has not noted our source.

5. Cf Bacher, "Die Agada der palästinischen Amoräer" III, p. 356, note 6.

6. Cf 10:8, and 14ff. In view of the probable antiquity of the Testament, its use of the terminology now familiar to us from the Dead Sea Scrolls, "a son of darkness, not of light", deserves further consideration. The origins of this work, written presumably in Aramaic at the beginning of the first century BCE (see above, p. 42, and note 4 ad loc.), are obscure. It is possible, however, that the author's use of this type of language, may be an indication of the ideological background of the Testament. From the fragments discovered, the Dead Sea Covenanters' interest in apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature is fairly well established (cf G.R. Driver, "The Judaean Scrolls", p. 448ff). It is conceivable, therefore, that a work like the Testament of Job may have had some association with the early Jewish sectarians in Palestine.

7. The expressions used in the Testament bear a striking resemblance to those used in the Sybilline Oracles to describe Nero Redivivus, who is to return as

the "Dragon", having the "form of a beast", and "the terrible serpent" (cf ed. Geffchen, viii, 88 and 157; v, 29 and 215-219). From his description of Elihu, the author of the Testament evidently regarded this personality as a kind of anti-Christ figure, seeking to undo Job, the personification of virtue.

8. Cf *ibid.*, 10:7.

9. Elihu appears already in an early source as one of the pagan prophets (cf *Seder Olam* 21, and Ratner *ad loc.* p. 93, for parallels). Moreover, the tradition that Elihu was actually a member of Abraham's family gained wide currency (cf Targum to Job 32:2; also *Yalkut Balak* 766, and particularly PT *Soṭah* v, 20d, where R. Eleazar b. Azariah identifies Elihu with Isaac himself).

10. Cf C.H. Gordon, "Leviathan: Symbol of Evil", in "Biblical Motifs", Cambridge Mass., 1966, p. 1ff.

11. See the material cited by Gordon *op. cit.*, p. 4.

12. In the Orphitic Diagram, Leviathan is the name for the outer band of darkness which surrounds the Archontes (cf Origen, "Contra Celsum" vi, 35). In "Pistis Sophia" (cxxxvi, 127), this dragon of the outer darkness appears as the fourth of the places of dreadfulness ("The outer darkness is a great dragon whose tail is in its mouth in that ^{the} darkness is out side the whole world and
^

encompasses it"). Bousset further identifies the Orphitic Leviathan with the Mandaean king of darkness, Ur (cf "Hauptprobleme der Gnosis", p. 351). In all these sources, the association of the Leviathan with darkness is a recurring theme. Although this association is not explicitly mentioned in the Testament of Job, it may be reflected in the notion that Elihu, the son of darkness, is a devotee of the dragon, the source of darkness.

13. The sinister associations of the Leviathan which we find in other sources, have apparently been transferred in rabbinic traditions to the closely related figure of the Serpent, the instrument of Satan in the creation story (see the material cited by Ginzberg, "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 100, note 83, also p. 123, note 131). It is to be noted, however, that older rabbinic sources do not identify the Leviathan (= Dragon) with the Serpent, although this identification is to be found in early non-rabbinic literature (compare the Testament of Job, cited above, p. 277, also the material quoted in note 7 and in the preceding note, and see particularly Revelations 12:9), and may have a basis in the Bible itself, where the Leviathan is described as a נחש (cf Is. 27:1, עַל לִוְיָתָן נָחַשׁ בָּרָח וְעַל לִוְיָתָן נָחַשׁ עָקְלָתוֹן, and compare the parallel description of LOTAN (= לִוְיָתָן) in the Ugaritic epic, בָּתָן (פָּתָן) בָּרַח בָּתָן עָקְלָתָן, Gordon, "Ugaritic Textbook", text 67 I, 1f). The identi-

fication of the Leviathan with the Serpent is a subject which calls for further investigation, as the biblical account of the Serpent's attempts to disrupt the harmony of Eden may be a development of the older myth of the Primordial Dragon's efforts to resist the establishment of a cosmos by the creator-deity (cf Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics", XI, p. 403).

Consequently, those sources which identify the Serpent with the Dragon may have an ancient tradition regarding the background of the Genesis story. For allusions to the sinister role of the Leviathan on Kabbalistic literature, cf Ginzberg op. cit., p. 47, note 127.

14. The Behemoth, like the Ziz, is mentioned only once in tannaitic sources, in a Baraitha in the name of R. Meir, who found an allusion to all three mythical beasts in Job 12:7-8: "ואולם שאל נא בהמות ותורן" - זו בהמות בהררי אלף, "ועוף השמים ויגד לך" - זה זיו שדי, "או שיח לארץ ותורן" - זה גן עדן, "ויספרו לך דגי הים" - זה לויתן, ' (cf PK p. 58a, and the parallels cited by Mandelbaum, p. 112). For further tannatic comments on the Leviathan, see above pp. 281 and 284 ; also R. Jose b. Durmaskith's statement based on Job 41:7 and 22, that the Leviathan is a "kasher" fish (cf Sifra on Lev. 11:10, ed. Weiss, p. 49b; also Tos. Hul. 3 (end), ed. Zucker., p. 506; and Hul. 67b): "לויטן דג טהור הוא, שנאמר 'גאווה אפיקי מגנים תחתיו חדודי חדש', 'גאווה אפיקי מגנים' - אלו קשקשים, 'תחתיו חדודי חדש' - 'גאווה אפיקי מגנים' - אלו קשקשים, 'תחתיו חדודי חדש' - אלו סנפירים שלו. It is noteworthy, that verses from the

Book of Job are cited in all the tannaitic sources relating to the mythical monsters.

15. Cf Enoch 60:7-10, where the creation of the Behemoth and the Leviathan is mentioned as having taken place on the fifth day, in agreement with GR 7:4 (ed. T-A, p. 52); see also Enoch *ibid.*, 24, and the Apocaplypse of Baruch 29:4, where reference is made to the eating of these creatures by the pious.

16. From the many sources cited by Ginzberg (*op. cit.*, p. 45, note 127), we see that the notion of the Leviathan as part of the cosmic order certainly was known in Jewish circles. We may mention particularly the Apocalypse of Abraham, 10, which already refers to a tradition found in later rabbinic sources, that the world rests upon the Leviathan. However, as to Goodenough's "feeling" that these mysteries may have reflected some association in Jewish ideas between the Leviathan, consumed in the hereafter, and the Messiah or Christ, is itself highly speculative, and would require considerable substantiation (cf "Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman World" V, p. 38).

17. Cf PK 29, p. 187b-188a (ed. Mandelbaum, p. 455, and the parallels cited *ad loc.*).

18. Presumably, the midrashic rendering of לִיָּוִת as

מטליה, "a patch", is based on the parallel between the Aramaic מטללא (= סוכה; see Targum on Job ad loc.), and מטליה. These nouns are from cognate roots, טלל and טלי respectively. Moreover, we actually find the expression מטליותא (= מטליה) as the Aramaic rendering for the Hebrew סוכה (cf Berliner, "Targum Onkelos" II, p. 37, on Lev. 23:43).

19. We have adopted here Buber's suggested emendation of the text, as the version found in all MSS and printed editions (הרוחות שלו...) is untranslatable. In MS Oxford an additional expression is found, פופסיס or פופסיס, which, according to Lieberman (Mandelbaum, p. 476), stands for the Greek, APOPSASIS, "appearance" (hence, פופסיס הרודות שלו, "the appearance of its fins"). In the context of this Aggadah, the expression פופסיס / APOPSASIS, is particularly appropriate, since in Greek this term occurs in conjunction with the sun (APOPSASIS HELIOU), as Lieberman observes.

The theme of the Leviathan's splendour is elaborated further in the Pesikta (loc. cit.) in conjunction with clause B of Job 41:22, ירפד חרוץ עלי טיט, which implies that the Leviathan's resting-place on the sea-bed, far from being offensive, as in the case other fish, is of fine gold (see also Mayan Gannim ad loc., ed. Buber, p. 133):
 אין לך מזוהם של דג אלא מקום רפידתו, ומקום
 רפידתו של לויתן יפה הוא מזהב, לכך נאמר "ירפד חרוץ עלי

20. See above, p. 191f and the material cited in the notes ad loc., particularly note 14, for the sources relating to a similar tradition regarding the countenance of Adam; on the supernatural lustre of the Ziz, see above, p. 298.

21. See above, p. 191.

22. Cf BB 75a: והשאר פורסו הקנ'ה על חוצות ירושלים וזיה מבהיק מסוף העולם ועד סופו, שנאמר, והלכו גוים לאורך מלכים לנוגה זרחך. A further parallel is noted by Ginzberg (op. cit., V, p. 103, note 93). According to R. Meir, the כתנות עור God made for Adam and Eve were כתנות אור, "garments of light" (GR 20:12, ed. T-A, p. 196). In the later sources cited by Ginzberg, these lustrous garments are said to have been made from the hide of the Leviathan.

23. Cf BB 74b; also Yalkut Yonah 550; see further Kohut in ZDMG XXI, p. 586ff.

24. Cf PK p. 57b-58a (ed. Mandelbaum, p. 112-113, for parallels).

25. This type of exegesis has its parallels in our sources. See, for example, the midrashic comment on דרר in Gen. 9:12, which occurs defectively only in this passage (cf Midrash Haseroth Witheroth, Battei Midrashoth

II, p. 236, 21); similarly, the expression כַּסֵּל which occurs defectively only in Lev. 19:14 (op. cit., p. 271, 93); see also the comment on יִרְמִיָּהּ for יִרְמִיָּהוּ which occurs only in Jer. 28:5 (op. cit., p. 310, 194; see further p. 312, 228 on הָדָר, Psalms 107:1).

26. The text is emended here on the basis of Bekhor.55a, and the MSS cited by Rabinovicz, Dik. Sopherim ad loc..

27. Probably the Tanna has taken יִגִּי as יִגִּי, viz. interchange of gutturals ך and ף.

28. See also above, p. 292, where R. Johanan b. Nappaha applies to the Leviathan a further verse which, in the biblical text, relates to the Behemoth, 40:19 (see also Ibn Ezra on Job ad loc., and his introduction to his commentary on the Pentateuch, where he refers to a further interpretation of this same verse, taken presumably from older sources, once again with reference to the Leviathan). See also H. Gunkel, "Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Enzeit", p. 54. On the female partners of the Behemoth and the Leviathan, see BB 74b, where, on the basis of Job 40:16, the male Behemoth is described as having been castrated, and the female made sterile; see also GR 7:4 (ed. T-A, p. 52) on 40:17; also Midrash Konen (Jellineck, BHM II, p. 26) and Targum Yerushalmi to Gen. 1:21.

29. Cf BB 75a.

30. Viz. "he makes the sea like a compound of incense (lit. "like a seething mixture")".

31. Viz. "After him he lightens a path (in the sea; i.e. uncovering it to the light of day)"; lit. "He makes a path to shine after him".

32. Cf PK p. 188a (ed. Mandelbaum, p. 456). While this use of the verb אָנח is without parallel in either biblical or mishnaic Hebrew, it does not contravene the principles of Hebrew grammar entirely. The privative use of the pi'el - of which the hithpa'el is the reflexive - is well known, and may have provided the Aggadist with a basis for his exposition of אָנח .

33. Lit. "By reason of their despair they are beside themselves".

34. Cf Thespis, pp. 137 and 150-151.

35. See above, p. 193f.

36. See the material cited by Pope on Job ad loc., p. 286f. Certain phrases and figures of speech in our passage from Job have their parallels in the epic poem, שִׁירַת הַיָּם , which represents a historicisation and dramatisation of the ancient conflict myth (cf Cassuto, "Commentary on the Book of Exodus", Jerusalem 1959, p. 122ff; also S.E. Löwenstamm, cited above p. 179, note

92):

- a) גאה גאה : גאווה (Job 41:7, and Ex. 15:1).
- b) ירדו במצולות כמו אבן : לבו יצוק כמו אבן (Job
ibid., 16; Ex. ibid., 5, also 16).
- c) משתו יגורו אלים : מי כמוך באלים (Job ibid., 17;
Ex. ibid., 11).
- d) ארדף אשיג... אריק חרבי : משיגהו חרב (Job
ibid., 18; Ex. ibid., 9).
- e) יאכלמו בקש : לקש נהפכו לו (Job ibid., 20; Ex.
ibid., 7).

also the significant expressions, מצולה, תהום, ים (Job
ibid., 23-24; Ex. 5 and 9). It is interesting to note
that in his exegesis of this passage, our unknown
Aggadist introduces two further terms, the operative
expression מלחמה, and the verb בהל (מתבהלין; cf Ex.
ibid., 3 and 15, או נבהלו).

37. See also Targum, Syriac, Aquila and Symmachos on
Job ad loc..

38. Cf PK loc. cit..

39. The text is emended on the basis of Yalkut Job 927,
PK reads, ואיכפת לו (see also Mandelbaum ad loc.).

40. So Yalkut.

41. Lit. "His scales are his pride". Presumably, the
Aggadist has taken אפיקי as אפיק, 'aph'el of נפק.

42. Taking yon as y'on; lit. "nor the spear, the dart, nor the pointed shaft".
43. Lit. "Who maketh winds his messengers".
44. See further Tanhuma OV Nizabhim, 4.
45. Cf Lev. R. 13:3.
46. See Gaster op. cit., p. 150-151.
47. Cf PK loc. cit..
48. Viz. KYNEGIA, "chase", "hunt".
49. Cf BB 74b; also Midrash Alpha-Bethoth, Bat. Mid., 2nd ed. II, p. 437-8, for a more detailed account of this conflict in conjunction with the same verses from Job.
50. Cf particularly Is. 27:1, and Gaster, op. cit. p. 142ff.
51. Op. cit., p. 150-151.
52. Above, p. 289.
53. Cf BB 75a.
54. Cf Targum and Rashi ad loc..
55. Cf PK loc. cit..
56. Viz. PRAGMATEUTES, "merchant" or "trader".

57. Cf PK loc. cit..
58. See ed. Mandelbaum ad loc..
59. So Yalkut Job 927; PK reads .
60. The allusion to the Leviathan in this verse is probably contained in clause A: כִּי לֹוִיתָ הֵן הֵם לִרְאֹשָׁן
לֹוִיתָ = לֹוִיתָ.
61. Cf BB loc. cit.. Presumably, the Midrash has taken נַעֲרֵי, viz. "young ones", in the metaphoric sense of small, or inferior in virtue.
62. Cf Lev. R. 13:3; also Nistaroth R. Shimon b. Yohai (Jellinek, BHM, III, p. 80), where the Ziz is introduced into the combat between the Behemoth and the Leviathan, the latter monster being slain by the Ziz, which is slain in turn by God.
63. Cf Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 47, note 134ff.
64. Cf Lev. R. 22:10; also GR 19:4 (ed. T-A, p. 173).
65. Lit. "Does the hawk soar by your wisdom, and stretch her wings towards the south.". The allusion to the sun in this verse is probably based on the notion that the sun journeys towards the south (cf Eccles. 1:5-6).
66. Cf Git. 31b and BB 25a, where this same verse from Job occurs in connection with the Ben Neẓ. No reference

is made, however, to the sparkling of this creature, only to its role as a bulwark against the south wind:

... ורוח דרומית קשה מכולן ואילמלא בן נץ מעמידה, מחרבת כל העולם כולו מפניה, שנ' "המבינתך יאבר נץ יפרוש כנפיו. "The south wind is the worst of all the winds, and were it not that the Ben Nez halts it, it would destroy the whole world before it, as it is said, "Does the Ben Nez soar by your wisdom, stretching its wings against the south wind.").

67. We can safely discount in this context the purely aggadic explanation that the name Ziz is derived from the varied tastes of this bird; cf Lev. R. loc. cit..

68. Viz. זיז = ציץ, with which it is linguistically associated, hence, "something glistening" (cf Jastrow, sub ציץ, p. 1279).

69. See below, p. 393, note 1.

70. In talmudic sources, this verse is applied to the Bar Yokhni (cf Bekhor. 57b; also Menah. 66b): פעם אחת נפל^ה ביצת בר יוכני וטבעה ששים כרכים ושברה שלוש מאות ארזים, ומי שדיא לה? והא כתיב, כנף רננים נעלסה, א'ר ("On one occasion, an egg of the Bar Yokhni fell and inundated sixty cities, also breaking three hundred cedars! But did it really drop it? Surely it is written, 'By its wings the Bar Yokhni carries its egg, ascends and descends'? R. Ashi said:

That egg was a bad one!"). In Menahoth loc. cit., נעלם is explicitly expounded as a Notarikon, נושא ועולה ומתחטא (see also Sifra to Lev. 2:14, ed Weiss p. 12b; also Rashi on Menah. ad loc., as emended by מסורת הש"ס). For the rendering of מתחטא as "to descend", see Rashi on both Menahoth and Bekhoroth, and Tosaphoth on the former source, also the preceding verse in Job. On the Bar Yokhni, see further, Ginzberg op. cit., V, p. 47, note 138; also JE II, p. 512.

71. In midrashic sources, the expression שכן in this verse is taken simply as a dialectical variant for

הרנגול, "a cock", cf Lev. R. 25:5, and the parallels cited by Margulies ad loc., p. 575.

72. Op. cit., p. 48.

73. See above, p. 193f, in connection with the Primordial Waters.

74. Cf Gaster op. cit., p. 137.

75. Cf M.H. Pope op cit., p. 268ff.

76. Cf M.H. Pope op. cit..

77. Cf C.H. Gordon, "Ugaritic Textbook", Glossary, sub "ykn", p. 410f (1096); also sub "nš", p. 446 (1684).

CHAPTER FIVE: THE GENERATION OF THE FLOOD

I. Introductory Comments

Having outlined the purpose and scope of this chapter in our introduction, we now proceed to a brief evaluation of the place occupied by the Generation of the Flood in both rabbinic, and early non-rabbinic sources. The marked tendency in talmudic-midrashic literature, to portray the Generation of the Flood as the scriptural prototype for evil, has its origins early in the pre-Christian period. The vague and generalising comment in Gen. 6:12, that "all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth", was already transformed by apocryphal writers into a well-defined catalogue of crimes, embracing every aspect of religious, moral and social degeneracy. Godlessness and idolatry,¹ fornication and licentiousness,² murder and lawlessness,³ sorcery,⁴ tyranny, lying and slander,⁵ all appear in early descriptions of the Antediluvians' corrupt behaviour. In all probability, these graphic accounts were inspired by the actual religious and social conditions of the period in which their authors lived. As we shall show

corruption
of the world
at that time
was such
as to
bring down
the wrath of
God upon it
and destroy
it by flood
and fire
as the
Scripture
saith
Gen. 6:11-13
and 7:1-2
and 1 Peter 3:20
and 2 Peter 2:4-5
and Jude 1:7
and 2 John 1:10-11
and 3 John 1:10-11
and 1 John 2:1-2
and 1 John 2:15-17
and 1 John 2:18-19
and 1 John 2:20-23
and 1 John 2:24-25
and 1 John 2:26-27
and 1 John 2:28-29
and 1 John 2:30-31
and 1 John 2:32-33
and 1 John 2:34-35
and 1 John 2:36-37
and 1 John 2:38-39
and 1 John 2:40-41
and 1 John 2:42-43
and 1 John 2:44-45
and 1 John 2:46-47
and 1 John 2:48-49
and 1 John 2:50-51
and 1 John 2:52-53
and 1 John 2:54-55
and 1 John 2:56-57
and 1 John 2:58-59
and 1 John 2:60-61
and 1 John 2:62-63
and 1 John 2:64-65
and 1 John 2:66-67
and 1 John 2:68-69
and 1 John 2:70-71
and 1 John 2:72-73
and 1 John 2:74-75
and 1 John 2:76-77
and 1 John 2:78-79
and 1 John 2:80-81
and 1 John 2:82-83
and 1 John 2:84-85
and 1 John 2:86-87
and 1 John 2:88-89
and 1 John 2:90-91
and 1 John 2:92-93
and 1 John 2:94-95
and 1 John 2:96-97
and 1 John 2:98-99
and 1 John 2:100-101
and 1 John 2:102-103
and 1 John 2:104-105
and 1 John 2:106-107
and 1 John 2:108-109
and 1 John 2:110-111
and 1 John 2:112-113
and 1 John 2:114-115
and 1 John 2:116-117
and 1 John 2:118-119
and 1 John 2:120-121
and 1 John 2:122-123
and 1 John 2:124-125
and 1 John 2:126-127
and 1 John 2:128-129
and 1 John 2:130-131
and 1 John 2:132-133
and 1 John 2:134-135
and 1 John 2:136-137
and 1 John 2:138-139
and 1 John 2:140-141
and 1 John 2:142-143
and 1 John 2:144-145
and 1 John 2:146-147
and 1 John 2:148-149
and 1 John 2:150-151
and 1 John 2:152-153
and 1 John 2:154-155
and 1 John 2:156-157
and 1 John 2:158-159
and 1 John 2:160-161
and 1 John 2:162-163
and 1 John 2:164-165
and 1 John 2:166-167
and 1 John 2:168-169
and 1 John 2:170-171
and 1 John 2:172-173
and 1 John 2:174-175
and 1 John 2:176-177
and 1 John 2:178-179
and 1 John 2:180-181
and 1 John 2:182-183
and 1 John 2:184-185
and 1 John 2:186-187
and 1 John 2:188-189
and 1 John 2:190-191
and 1 John 2:192-193
and 1 John 2:194-195
and 1 John 2:196-197
and 1 John 2:198-199
and 1 John 2:200-201
and 1 John 2:202-203
and 1 John 2:204-205
and 1 John 2:206-207
and 1 John 2:208-209
and 1 John 2:210-211
and 1 John 2:212-213
and 1 John 2:214-215
and 1 John 2:216-217
and 1 John 2:218-219
and 1 John 2:220-221
and 1 John 2:222-223
and 1 John 2:224-225
and 1 John 2:226-227
and 1 John 2:228-229
and 1 John 2:230-231
and 1 John 2:232-233
and 1 John 2:234-235
and 1 John 2:236-237
and 1 John 2:238-239
and 1 John 2:240-241
and 1 John 2:242-243
and 1 John 2:244-245
and 1 John 2:246-247
and 1 John 2:248-249
and 1 John 2:250-251
and 1 John 2:252-253
and 1 John 2:254-255
and 1 John 2:256-257
and 1 John 2:258-259
and 1 John 2:260-261
and 1 John 2:262-263
and 1 John 2:264-265
and 1 John 2:266-267
and 1 John 2:268-269
and 1 John 2:270-271
and 1 John 2:272-273
and 1 John 2:274-275
and 1 John 2:276-277
and 1 John 2:278-279
and 1 John 2:280-281
and 1 John 2:282-283
and 1 John 2:284-285
and 1 John 2:286-287
and 1 John 2:288-289
and 1 John 2:290-291
and 1 John 2:292-293
and 1 John 2:294-295
and 1 John 2:296-297
and 1 John 2:298-299
and 1 John 2:300-301
and 1 John 2:302-303
and 1 John 2:304-305
and 1 John 2:306-307
and 1 John 2:308-309
and 1 John 2:310-311
and 1 John 2:312-313
and 1 John 2:314-315
and 1 John 2:316-317
and 1 John 2:318-319
and 1 John 2:320-321
and 1 John 2:322-323
and 1 John 2:324-325
and 1 John 2:326-327
and 1 John 2:328-329
and 1 John 2:330-331
and 1 John 2:332-333
and 1 John 2:334-335
and 1 John 2:336-337
and 1 John 2:338-339
and 1 John 2:340-341
and 1 John 2:342-343
and 1 John 2:344-345
and 1 John 2:346-347
and 1 John 2:348-349
and 1 John 2:350-351
and 1 John 2:352-353
and 1 John 2:354-355
and 1 John 2:356-357
and 1 John 2:358-359
and 1 John 2:360-361
and 1 John 2:362-363
and 1 John 2:364-365
and 1 John 2:366-367
and 1 John 2:368-369
and 1 John 2:370-371
and 1 John 2:372-373
and 1 John 2:374-375
and 1 John 2:376-377
and 1 John 2:378-379
and 1 John 2:380-381
and 1 John 2:382-383
and 1 John 2:384-385
and 1 John 2:386-387
and 1 John 2:388-389
and 1 John 2:390-391
and 1 John 2:392-393
and 1 John 2:394-395
and 1 John 2:396-397
and 1 John 2:398-399
and 1 John 2:400-401
and 1 John 2:402-403
and 1 John 2:404-405
and 1 John 2:406-407
and 1 John 2:408-409
and 1 John 2:410-411
and 1 John 2:412-413
and 1 John 2:414-415
and 1 John 2:416-417
and 1 John 2:418-419
and 1 John 2:420-421
and 1 John 2:422-423
and 1 John 2:424-425
and 1 John 2:426-427
and 1 John 2:428-429
and 1 John 2:430-431
and 1 John 2:432-433
and 1 John 2:434-435
and 1 John 2:436-437
and 1 John 2:438-439
and 1 John 2:440-441
and 1 John 2:442-443
and 1 John 2:444-445
and 1 John 2:446-447
and 1 John 2:448-449
and 1 John 2:450-451
and 1 John 2:452-453
and 1 John 2:454-455
and 1 John 2:456-457
and 1 John 2:458-459
and 1 John 2:460-461
and 1 John 2:462-463
and 1 John 2:464-465
and 1 John 2:466-467
and 1 John 2:468-469
and 1 John 2:470-471
and 1 John 2:472-473
and 1 John 2:474-475
and 1 John 2:476-477
and 1 John 2:478-479
and 1 John 2:480-481
and 1 John 2:482-483
and 1 John 2:484-485
and 1 John 2:486-487
and 1 John 2:488-489
and 1 John 2:490-491
and 1 John 2:492-493
and 1 John 2:494-495
and 1 John 2:496-497
and 1 John 2:498-499
and 1 John 2:500-501
and 1 John 2:502-503
and 1 John 2:504-505
and 1 John 2:506-507
and 1 John 2:508-509
and 1 John 2:510-511
and 1 John 2:512-513
and 1 John 2:514-515
and 1 John 2:516-517
and 1 John 2:518-519
and 1 John 2:520-521
and 1 John 2:522-523
and 1 John 2:524-525
and 1 John 2:526-527
and 1 John 2:528-529
and 1 John 2:530-531
and 1 John 2:532-533
and 1 John 2:534-535
and 1 John 2:536-537
and 1 John 2:538-539
and 1 John 2:540-541
and 1 John 2:542-543
and 1 John 2:544-545
and 1 John 2:546-547
and 1 John 2:548-549
and 1 John 2:550-551
and 1 John 2:552-553
and 1 John 2:554-555
and 1 John 2:556-557
and 1 John 2:558-559
and 1 John 2:560-561
and 1 John 2:562-563
and 1 John 2:564-565
and 1 John 2:566-567
and 1 John 2:568-569
and 1 John 2:570-571
and 1 John 2:572-573
and 1 John 2:574-575
and 1 John 2:576-577
and 1 John 2:578-579
and 1 John 2:580-581
and 1 John 2:582-583
and 1 John 2:584-585
and 1 John 2:586-587
and 1 John 2:588-589
and 1 John 2:590-591
and 1 John 2:592-593
and 1 John 2:594-595
and 1 John 2:596-597
and 1 John 2:598-599
and 1 John 2:600-601
and 1 John 2:602-603
and 1 John 2:604-605
and 1 John 2:606-607
and 1 John 2:608-609
and 1 John 2:610-611
and 1 John 2:612-613
and 1 John 2:614-615
and 1 John 2:616-617
and 1 John 2:618-619
and 1 John 2:620-621
and 1 John 2:622-623
and 1 John 2:624-625
and 1 John 2:626-627
and 1 John 2:628-629
and 1 John 2:630-631
and 1 John 2:632-633
and 1 John 2:634-635
and 1 John 2:636-637
and 1 John 2:638-639
and 1 John 2:640-641
and 1 John 2:642-643
and 1 John 2:644-645
and 1 John 2:646-647
and 1 John 2:648-649
and 1 John 2:650-651
and 1 John 2:652-653
and 1 John 2:654-655
and 1 John 2:656-657
and 1 John 2:658-659
and 1 John 2:660-661
and 1 John 2:662-663
and 1 John 2:664-665
and 1 John 2:666-667
and 1 John 2:668-669
and 1 John 2:670-671
and 1 John 2:672-673
and 1 John 2:674-675
and 1 John 2:676-677
and 1 John 2:678-679
and 1 John 2:680-681
and 1 John 2:682-683
and 1 John 2:684-685
and 1 John 2:686-687
and 1 John 2:688-689
and 1 John 2:690-691
and 1 John 2:692-693
and 1 John 2:694-695
and 1 John 2:696-697
and 1 John 2:698-699
and 1 John 2:700-701
and 1 John 2:702-703
and 1 John 2:704-705
and 1 John 2:706-707
and 1 John 2:708-709
and 1 John 2:710-711
and 1 John 2:712-713
and 1 John 2:714-715
and 1 John 2:716-717
and 1 John 2:718-719
and 1 John 2:720-721
and 1 John 2:722-723
and 1 John 2:724-725
and 1 John 2:726-727
and 1 John 2:728-729
and 1 John 2:730-731
and 1 John 2:732-733
and 1 John 2:734-735
and 1 John 2:736-737
and 1 John 2:738-739
and 1 John 2:740-741
and 1 John 2:742-743
and 1 John 2:744-745
and 1 John 2:746-747
and 1 John 2:748-749
and 1 John 2:750-751
and 1 John 2:752-753
and 1 John 2:754-755
and 1 John 2:756-757
and 1 John 2:758-759
and 1 John 2:760-761
and 1 John 2:762-763
and 1 John 2:764-765
and 1 John 2:766-767
and 1 John 2:768-769
and 1 John 2:770-771
and 1 John 2:772-773
and 1 John 2:774-775
and 1 John 2:776-777
and 1 John 2:778-779
and 1 John 2:780-781
and 1 John 2:782-783
and 1 John 2:784-785
and 1 John 2:786-787
and 1 John 2:788-789
and 1 John 2:790-791
and 1 John 2:792-793
and 1 John 2:794-795
and 1 John 2:796-797
and 1 John 2:798-799
and 1 John 2:800-801
and 1 John 2:802-803
and 1 John 2:804-805
and 1 John 2:806-807
and 1 John 2:808-809
and 1 John 2:810-811
and 1 John 2:812-813
and 1 John 2:814-815
and 1 John 2:816-817
and 1 John 2:818-819
and 1 John 2:820-821
and 1 John 2:822-823
and 1 John 2:824-825
and 1 John 2:826-827
and 1 John 2:828-829
and 1 John 2:830-831
and 1 John 2:832-833
and 1 John 2:834-835
and 1 John 2:836-837
and 1 John 2:838-839
and 1 John 2:840-841
and 1 John 2:842-843
and 1 John 2:844-845
and 1 John 2:846-847
and 1 John 2:848-849
and 1 John 2:850-851
and 1 John 2:852-853
and 1 John 2:854-855
and 1 John 2:856-857
and 1 John 2:858-859
and 1 John 2:860-861
and 1 John 2:862-863
and 1 John 2:864-865
and 1 John 2:866-867
and 1 John 2:868-869
and 1 John 2:870-871
and 1 John 2:872-873
and 1 John 2:874-875
and 1 John 2:876-877
and 1 John 2:878-879
and 1 John 2:880-881
and 1 John 2:882-883
and 1 John 2:884-885
and 1 John 2:886-887
and 1 John 2:888-889
and 1 John 2:890-891
and 1 John 2:892-893
and 1 John 2:894-895
and 1 John 2:896-897
and 1 John 2:898-899
and 1 John 2:900-901
and 1 John 2:902-903
and 1 John 2:904-905
and 1 John 2:906-907
and 1 John 2:908-909
and 1 John 2:910-911
and 1 John 2:912-913
and 1 John 2:914-915
and 1 John 2:916-917
and 1 John 2:918-919
and 1 John 2:920-921
and 1 John 2:922-923
and 1 John 2:924-925
and 1 John 2:926-927
and 1 John 2:928-929
and 1 John 2:930-931
and 1 John 2:932-933
and 1 John 2:934-935
and 1 John 2:936-937
and 1 John 2:938-939
and 1 John 2:940-941
and 1 John 2:942-943
and 1 John 2:944-945
and 1 John 2:946-947
and 1 John 2:948-949
and 1 John 2:950-951
and 1 John 2:952-953
and 1 John 2:954-955
and 1 John 2:956-957
and 1 John 2:958-959
and 1 John 2:960-961
and 1 John 2:962-963
and 1 John 2:964-965
and 1 John 2:966-967
and 1 John 2:968-969
and 1 John 2:970-971
and 1 John 2:972-973
and 1 John 2:974-975
and 1 John 2:976-977
and 1 John 2:978-979
and 1 John 2:980-981
and 1 John 2:982-983
and 1 John 2:984-985
and 1 John 2:986-987
and 1 John 2:988-989
and 1 John 2:990-991
and 1 John 2:992-993
and 1 John 2:994-995
and 1 John 2:996-997
and 1 John 2:998-999
and 1 John 2:1000-1001

subsequently, a number of the traditions and notions were developed by the rabbinic scholars in association with proof-texts from the Book of Job. From among the multiplicity of crimes ascribed to the Generation of the Flood, idolatry, immorality and violence - the three cardinal sins of early Jewish teachings, which were to be avoided even at the cost of one's life - figure as the main offences of this wicked generation. They occur already in the Book of Jubilees as the major cause for the onset of the deluge.⁶ Similarly, in the first century of the current era, the author of II Enoch depicts the world as quaking with the "injustice, wrongs (=violence), and fornication and idolatry" of the Antediluvians.⁷ In rabbinic sources, the Amora, R. Levi, found an allusion to the idolatry, immorality and bloodshed which filled the earth at the time of its destruction, in the expression *בשר* (Gen. 6:11).⁸ As will be seen from the numerous statements quoted below, which form only a part of the abundant material preserved in our sources, the rejection of God, violence and immorality are the major themes employed by the Rabbis in their development of the Antediluvians as a prototype

for evil. In the following pages we will examine the special place occupied by the Book of Job in the exposition of these themes by both Tannaim and Amoraim.

II. The Revolt against God

In keeping with the tradition formulated by R. Judah the Patriarch, that Job's specific role was to reveal the details of the Flood story,⁹ it is his two speeches in chapters 21 and 24¹⁰ - dealing, appropriately, with the conduct and conditions of the wicked - which figure prominently in rabbinic homilies relating to the welfare and corruption of the Antedeluvians. The association between the Flood story and chapter 21 in particular, was probably established early in the tannaitic period, at least two generations prior to Judah the Patriarch. R. Akiba, in order to illustrate the Antediluvians' overbearing arrogance towards God, cites verse 15: וַיֹּאמְרוּ לֵקֶל סוּר מִמֶּנּוּ וְדַעַת דְּרָכֶיךָ לֹא תַפְצֹנּוּ a verse which figures prominently in the homilies of the Rabbis relating to the Generation of the Flood, as can be seen from the material quoted below. It is significant that R. Akiba merely quotes his proof-text without indicating any basis for its

application to his theme, which suggests that he already regarded the context from which he drew his quotation as referring specifically to the ¹¹

Antedeluvians: ר' עקיבא אומר, הרי הוא אומר "לא ידון רוחי באדם לעולם (בר' ו, 3) אמר הקב"ה הם לו דנו בעצמן שהן נשר ודם אלא הגיסו את רוחן כלפי מעלה, שנא' "ויאמרו לקל סור ממנו ודעת דרכיך לא חפצנו".¹²

More substantial evidence for a generally acknowledged association between chapter 21 and the Antedeluvians in tannaitic times, is preserved in the following homily, which occurs widely in tannaitic sources. On the basis of a lengthy excerpt from Job 21, an anonymous Aggadist develops the well-known theme that the cause of degeneracy is an excess of physical and material well-being. God bestowed His benefits upon the Generation of the Flood in abundance. However, the Antedeluvians, far from acknowledging the authority of their Divine Benefactor, arrogantly

renounce any allegiance to Him:¹³ דור המבול לא נתגאו אלא בשביל טובה שהשפיע להם הקב"ה. ומה כתיב בהם? "בתייהם שלום מפחד ולא שבט קלוח עליהם (איוב כ"א, 9)", ו"כתיב "שורו עור ולא יגעיל תפלט פרתו ולא תשכל (שם, 10)", ו"כתיב "ישלחו כצאן עויליהם וילדיהם ירקדון (שם 11)", ו"כתיב "ישאו בתף ובכנור וישמחו לקול עוגב (שם 12)", ו"כתיב "יבלו בטוב ימיהם וברגע שאול יחתו (שם 13)", והיא גרמה שאמרו "לקל סור ממנו ודעת דרכיך לא חפצנו. מה שדי כי נעבדנו ומה נועיל כי נפגע בו (שם 14-15)".

אמרו, כלום צדיקים אנו לו אלא לטפה של גשמים? יש לנו
נהרות ומעינות שאנו מסתפקין מהן. אמר הקב"ה. בטובה
שהטפתי להם בזה מכעיסין אותי ובה אני דן אותן שנא'
וואני הנני מביא את המבול מים (בר' ו' 17).

Both the notion expressed in this passage and the context in which it occurs, suggest that it has a polemical colouring. In most of the sources which record this Aggadah, the Generation of the Flood is bracketed with the Tower-Builders and the Sodomites in order to demonstrate that these offenders brought catastrophe upon themselves, by provoking God with their wickedness. It has been shown that statements of this type in talmudic-midrashic literature were usually directed against heretical - particularly Gnostic - criticisms of God's justice in His treatment of these and other biblical personalities who incurred Divine punishment.¹⁴ In emphasising God's beneficence towards the Antediluvians, and their arrogant opposition to His authority, our unknown Tanna presumably intended to blunt any criticisms of God's conduct in destroying the Generation of the Flood.

This picture of the Antediluvians refusing to acknowledge Divine Providence is of

further interest, as it may have been inspired by the conditions prevailing in Palestine during the tannaitic period. The destruction of the Temple and particularly the collapse of the Bar-Cochba Uprising with its subsequent persecutions, brought in their wake a severe disillusionment resulting in apostasy and doubt regarding God's control over the affairs of His world.¹⁵ This attitude of questioning and doubt is reflected particularly in the expositions of Ex. 17:7 (ה'יש ה' בקרבנו אם אין ?) by teachers who were active either in the troubled years following the fall of Jerusalem, or in the oppressive period of the Hadrianic persecutions.¹⁶ For our purposes, we may note particularly the interpretation suggested by R. Joshua b. Hananiah, and repeated two generations later by R. Judah b. 'Il'ai, both of whom portray Israel as declaring: אם הוא רבון כל במעשים כשם שהוא רבון עלינו ("If He is Lord over all things as He is Lord over us, we will serve Him, if not, we will not serve Him!"). The attitude reflected here and also in the above homily on the Generation of the Flood clearly coincides with the outlook of the Jewish heretic in tannaitic times, who, despite his awareness of God, refused to

acknowledge Him. Thus the classical example for the apostate in the period, Elisha b. Abuya, is characterised as one who "knew My power, yet rebelled against Me!"¹⁷ Similarly, an unknown Tanna interpreted Lev. 26:14 (יָדַעַתְּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְעַתָּה תִּשְׁמָר) with reference to the man "who knows his master, but is intent on rebelling against Him".¹⁸ R. Tarphon, a contemporary of R. Joshua b. Hananiah, relegated the Jewish heretic to a position lower than that of a pagan, because the latter does not know of God and, therefore denies Him, while the former denies God even though he knows of Him.¹⁹ We may conclude, therefore, that the unknown Aggadist who expounded upon the theme of the Antediluvians' rejection of Divine Authority, intended to portray them in terms of the heterodox tendencies of his own era, representing those who doubted, or actually denied the effectiveness of God's power in the world.

Further evidence for the portrayal of the Generation of the Flood in terms of the heretical notions current in the tannaitic period, is provided by the following passage, based once again on verses from the Book of Job. R. Meir, one of the outstanding teachers of the post Bar-Cochba period, incurs the disapproval of his colleagues

on account of his bold exposition of Job 34:29: והוא

According to R. Meir, this verse implies that God has withdrawn from His world, is no longer concerned in its affairs, a notion which he ascribes specifically to the Generation of the Flood on the basis of Eliphaz' words in 22:14:²⁰ "והוא ישקיט" מעולמו, "ויסתר פנים" מעולמו, כד"ן שמותחין וילון²² על פניו ואינו יודע מה נעשה בחוץ, כך אמרו דור המבול, "עבים סתר לו ולא יראה". אמרו לו, ד"ך מאיר! אמר להון, ומה הוא דכתיב "והוא ישקיט ומי ירשיע וגו'?" אמרו, נתן שלוח לדור המבול ומי בא וחייבן? ומה שלוח נתן להם? "זרעם נכון לפניהם עמם וצאצאיהם לעיניהם...." ישלחו כצאן עויליהם....". "ויסתר פנים ומי ישורנו", וכשהסתיר פניו מהם מי יאמר לו שלא עשית כשורה?

("R. Meir expounded the verse thus: 'He has given Himself rest from His world, He has hidden His face from His world', like a judge before whom they spread a curtain, so that he is ignorant of what is taking place without. Thus the Generation of the Flood declared: 'Thick clouds are a covering to Him that He seeth not! (Job 22:14)'²³. They said to him: 'Enough Meir!' He replied to them, 'Why then is it written: 'והוא ישקיט ומי ירשיע וגו'?' They answered: 'This verse implies that God bestowed tranquillity upon the Generation of the Flood, who then came and condemned them?! What was the nature

of the tranquillity which He bestowed upon them? 'Their seed is established in their sight with them, and their offspring before their eyes (ibid., 21:8).... They send forth their little ones like a flock.... (ibid., 11)....'²⁴

Consequently, when He hid His face from them, who could say to Him:²⁵ 'You have not acted correctly!'. .

In view of the conditions prevailing in Palestine during the years of R. Meir's activity, we may presume that the opposition of his colleagues to his exposition of Job 24:29, was not purely academic. It is conceivable that in certain sections of the oppressed and disillusioned population of Palestine, the notion that God had actually abandoned His world and had withdrawn from its affairs, was accepted as the explanation for Israel's continued misfortunes. While R. Meir endeavoured to portray the Generation of the Flood as the biblical prototypes for this heterodox outlook, his colleagues, on the other hand, took exception to his efforts to find a scriptural basis for the very notion they were obliged to combat. It is noteworthy, however, that R. Meir was consistent in introducing the theme of God's abandoning His world into his exegesis relating to the Generation of the Flood, as can be seen from his interpretation of Gen.

6:3: לא ידון רוחי באדם לעולם. According to R. Meir, these words were uttered, not by God, but by the Generation of the Flood, implying that "there is no judge in the world! God has forsaken His world!"

(אין דין בעולם, נטש המקום את העולם)²⁶ We may observe further that R. Meir, in ascribing this sentiment to the Generation of the Flood was influenced by his master, Akiba who, as we noted above, stresses the arrogant attitude of the Antediluvians towards heaven,²⁷ depicts them as declaring, "there is neither justice nor a judge!" (לית דין ו לית דין).²⁸

III. The Rejection of the Law

Closely linked with the Antediluvians' denial of Divine Authority is the theme of their rejection of the Law and the principles of justice. This is reflected once again in the exposition of Job 21:14-15, verses which, as we observed earlier, occupy a special place in rabbinic homilies relating to the Generation of the Flood. The Amora, R. Aha, found an allusion in these verses to the Antediluvians' rejection of four gifts offered them by God, - the Torah, afflictions, the sacrificial service and prayer. R. Aha stresses in conclusion that it was the rejection of the Law in particular which caused the

Generation of the Flood to forfeit life both in this world and in the next.²⁹ אמר ר' אחא. בקש הקב"ה ליתן להם ארבעה דברים, תורה ויסורין ועבודת קרבנות ותפלה, ולא בקשו שנה' "ויאמרו לקל חור ממנו" אלו היסורין, "ודעת דרכין לא הפצנו" זה תורה, ומה שדי כי נעבדנו" אלו הקרבנות, "ומה נועיל כי נפגע בו" זה תפלה. אמר להם הקב"ה. מי גרם לכם שתאבדו מן הערב של העוה"ז ומן הבקר של העוה"ב? מפני שלא קבלתם את התורה שיש בה דין שנאמר, "מבקר לערב יוכתו" - למה? - "מבלי משים לנצח יאבדו", ואין "משים" אלא דינין שנאמר "ואלה המשפטים אשר תשים לפניהם (שמות כ' א, 1)".

At the conclusion of his homily, R. Aha has cited a verse from Eliphaz' speech in chapter 4, without indicating the basis for its association with the Generation of the Flood. We may note that both verses 20 and 21 of this chapter were already applied to the theme of the Antediluvians' lawlessness by R. Meir in the second century CE,³⁰ who, on the basis of these two verses, expounds upon a notion which occurs widely in our sources, that the punishment of the Antediluvians was governed by the principle of ³¹מדה כנגד מדה. א"ר מאיר: הן לא עשו מדה³¹. מדה כנגד מדה! הדין לה' הדין למטה, אף אני איני עושה מדה הדין למעלה! ה' ה' "הלא נסע יתרו בם ימותו ולא בחכמה" - בלא חכמת התורה. "מבקר לערב יוכתו מבלי משים לנצח יאבדו" - ואין "משים" אלא דין המד' א "ולה המשפטים אשר תשים לפניהם (שם' שם)" (R. Meir said: They did not practise justice below, ³²therefore, I will not practise justice above! Thus

it is written, 'הלא נסע יחרם בם ימותו ולא בחכמה, 'Has not their excellency departed from them, they die without חכמה (verse 21)' - which means, lacking the wisdom of the Torah! מבקר לערב יוכתו מבלי משים לנוצח (verse 20), 'They will be cut off from the evening (i.e. this world) and the morning (i.e. the world to come), they perish forever without justice being applied to them!' משים connoting justice on the basis of the verse ואלה המשפטים אשר תשים לפניהם)

The idea R. Meir expresses is of some interest. By boldly asserting that God did not exercise strict justice in dealing with the Antediluvians, he probably intended to defend Divine Justice against the heretical views which were current in his day. Although God's destruction of the Antediluvians was not in conformity with strict legal principles, it was in accord with the dictates of moral justice, R. Meir argues. We may note that this line of argument was developed further in connection with the same two verses from Job, by a teacher living in the century after R. Meir. The Amora R. Hanina demonstrates how the Generation of the Flood committed their crimes in such a manner as to render them morally guilty, but legally inculpable. Therefore God declared that as the Antediluvians had cunningly placed

themselves beyond the reach of the law, He would punish them beyond the prescriptions of the law:³³ איזהו חמס ואיזה היא גזל? אמר ר' חנינא. חמס אינו שוה פרוטה, וגזל ששוה פרוטה. וכך היו אנשי המבול עושים, אחד מהם מוציא קופתו מליאה תורמוסים והיה זה בא ונוטל פחות משוה פרוטה, וזה בא ונוטל פחות משוה פרוטה עד מקום שאינו יכול להוציא ממנו בדין. א"ל הקב"ה, אתם עשיתם שלא כשורה, אף אני אעשה עמכם שלא כשורה. הה"ד, "הלא נסע יתרם בם ימותו ולא בחכמה" - בלא חכמת התורה - "מבקר לערב יוכתו מבלי משים לנצח יאבדו", ואין "משים" וגו'.....

('What does חמס connote as opposed to גזל? R. Hanina said: חמס connotes the stealing of an article less than the value of a perutah, while גזל connotes the stealing of an article worth at least a perutah. Thus the Generation of the Flood used to do, one of them would take out a basket full of lupines, others would then come, each of them taking an amount less than the value of a perutah, with the result that the robbed man could not claim from them at law! Whereupon God said to them: 'You have not acted in accordance with the line of strict justice, therefore, I will not deal with you according to the line of strict justice! ' Thus it is written etc.....").³⁴

The significance of R. Hanina's homily for the conditions prevailing in northern Palestine during the period of his activity has been noted by Buchler,

who observes that the cunning illicit conduct which R. Hanina ascribes to the Generation of the Flood, may be indicative of the practices he was obliged to combat in Sepphoris during the third century.³⁵ We would suggest that a much clearer indication of these conditions is to be found in the following which records an incident in which R. Hanina himself was involved. As a result of a sermon preached by him to the community of Sepphoris on the deceitful methods employed by the Antediluvians to escape apprehension while perpetrating their crimes, no less than three hundred robberies³⁶ were committed that same night:".....'and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the day (Gen. 6:5)'. From the moment that the sun shone until it set, there was nothing to hope for in them! Thus it is written, 'The murderer riseth with the light to kill the poor and the needy: and in the night he is like a thief (Job 24:14)'. But surely it is written, 'In the dark they dig through houses (ibid. 16; which implies that they actually committed robbery)'?! Why then is it written, 'like a thief'? Because they robbed houses 'which they had marked out for themselves by day (ibid. which implies that the manner in which they perpetrated their crimes was deceptive)'. For what did the Generation of the Flood use to do? They would

bring balsam, rub it on the stones of the houses they intended to rob, then return by night, smell out the house and break in! Thus R. Hanina lectured in Sepphoris, and that same night three hundred house-breakings were effected!....." ("וכל יצר מהשבות לבו רק רע כל היום" "זורחת ועד שהיתה שוקעת לא היתה בהם תוחלת, הה'ר, לאור יקום רוצח יקטל עני ואביון ובלילה יהי כגנב". והא כתיב "חתר בחשך בתיים" - למה? - "שיומם חתמו למו". מה היו עושים? היו מביאים אפופולסימון ושפ(ים) באבן ובאים בלילה ומריחים וחותרים. כך דרש ר' חנינא בצפורין, איתעביד ההוא ליליא תלת מאה חותריין.³⁷ (³⁸)

IV. A Generation of Licentiousness

Apart from violence and injustice, the scholars of northern Palestine were confronted with the more vexing problem of the low standard of morality.³⁹ These conditions prompted the Rabbis domiciled in Galilee to lay particular stress in their homilies on the immoral conduct of the Generation of the Flood and its catastrophic consequences.⁴⁰ Moreover, we may safely presume that a number of sexual offences ascribed to the Antediluvians in our sources, homosexuality,⁴¹ animalism, the practice of ius prima noctis, were not merely aggadic exaggerations. The abhorrent sexual deviations in which the pagan world indulged, left an indelible imprint on both the aggadic and halachic

utterances of the Rabbis. One tannaitic source⁴² refers to the long-standing customs of Egypt and Palestine - possibly part of the Hellenistic heritage of both these countries - for homosexual and lesbian marriages, polyandry and incest. Tosephta Avodah Zarah 3:2⁴³ - which retains a fuller version of the prohibitions contained in the corresponding Mishnah⁴⁴ - expresses in no uncertain terms the suspicions harboured by the Rabbis for the pagan population of Palestine. In pagan taverns even male beasts were not to be left with men, nor female beasts with women for fear of enticement. Similarly, a cow was not to be entrusted to the care of a solitary pagan shepherd, nor was a young boy to be entrusted to the tutelage of a pagan instructor.⁴⁵

If we view the various traditions relating to the Antediluvians' immorality in the light of the above sources, it is clear that they were regarded by the Rabbis as the scriptural counterpart for the corrupt and immoral elements in their own society. Several homilies relating to the Generation of the Flood presumably reflecting the conditions prevailing in the tannaitic period, have been associated with verses from chapter 24, which, as we have observed, occupied a special place in rabbinic thought relating to the Antediluvians' corrupt behaviour. In the following

passage, an unknown Aggadist, stressing once again the arrogance of the Generation of the Flood as reflected in Job 21:14, refers to their shameless practice of parading their nudity in public. Although this notion occurs rarely in rabbinic sources, it probably gained wide currency in talmudic times, and may have its

origins in high antiquity:⁴⁶ אנשי מבול גסות רוח היתה בהן ובה נעקרו מן העולם שנאמר, "ויאמרו לקל סור ממנו וגו'". "מה היו עושיין? היו פושטין בגדיהן ומניחין על גבי הארץ והולכין ערומים בשוק, שנאמר, "ערום הלכו בלי לבוש". הקב"ה הפיצן כזיקים על פני המים שנאמר, "קל הוא על פני המים". ואומר, "גורו מפני חרב כי חמה עונות חרב למען תדעו שדון" - על הקרי "שדון" אלא "שדין", שיש דין למעלה.

("The Generation of the Flood possessed a spirit of arrogance on account of which they were uprooted from the world! as it is said, 'They said to God, "Depart from us! etc"⁴⁷ (Job 24:14)' What did they do? They would strip off their clothes, leaving them on the ground, and walked naked in the market-place, as it is said, 'They went about naked without any garb⁴⁸ (ibid., 7)'. Therefore, God made them to float like skin-bottles upon the face of the waters, as it is said, 'The decree was that their destruction should be upon the face of the waters'⁴⁹ (ibid., 18)', and it is said, 'Be you afraid of the sword, for wrath brings the punishment of the sword, that you may know שדון (ibid., 19:29)' - do not read שדון, but שדין, meaning

that there is justice above!").

The particular practice presupposed by this source is not difficult to perceive. The performance of gymnastics in the nude was a visible aspect of Hellenistic culture in Palestine which evoked opposition already in Maccabae⁵⁰an times. That this practice continued to attract devotees from the Jewish community down to the rabbinic period, is clearly indicated by the frequent references in tannaitic sources to the הַמְּבַלֵּשׁ "the destroyer of the covenant", who endeavoured to conceal the obvious mark of his Jewishness that he might appear naked in public.⁵¹ However, we may presume that the imagery in this source reflects the customs of the pagan population of Palestine during the talmudic period, rather than a prevailing practice of the Jewish community. There are, on the other hand, one or two traditions in our sources relating to the Antediluvians' corrupt behaviour which may have been prompted by the unsavoury practices current within the Jewish community itself. A number of rabbinic comments on the subject of immoral conduct were intended as criticism particularly of the wealthier elements of the Jewish population in Galilee.⁵² Such criticism is preserved in the following passage based upon a further verse from Job 24. The Amora R.

Judah b. R. Simon describes in detail the custom of the Generation of the Flood to take two wives, one simply for the purpose of procreation, the other purely for sexual gratification:⁵³

„ויקח לו למך שתי נשים שם האחת עדה ושם השניה צלה“, א'ר עזרי' בשם ר' יהודה בר סימון: כך היו אנשי דור המבול עושין, היה אחד לוקח לו שתי נשים, אחת לפריה ורביה ואחת לתשמיש, זו שהיתה לפריה ורביה היתה יושבת כאילו אלמנה בחי בעלה,⁵⁴ וזו שהיתה לתשמיש היה משקה כוס עקרים שלא תלד והיתה יושבת אצלו מקושטת כזונה, הה'ד „רועה עקרה לא תלד ואלמנה לא יטיב“, תדע לך שכן שהרי הברור שבהן היה למך ולקח לו שתי נשים „שם האחת עדה – דעדת מניה – ושם השנית צלה – שהיתה יושבת בצלו.“

(„And Lemech took for himself two wives, one named 'Adah, and the second, Zillah (Gen. 4:19)'. R. Azariah said in the name of R. Judah b. Simon: This is what the Generation of the Flood used to do. Each one of them would take for himself two wives, one for the purpose of procreation, and the other purely for intercourse. The one reserved for procreation would sit like a widow in her husband's life-time, while the one reserved for intercourse he would give a root-drink to render her sterile, and she would sit beside him bedecked like a harlot! as it is written, 'He tendereth to the barren woman that she should not bear,⁵⁵ and he doeth not good to the widow (Job 24:21)'. Moreover, you may know that this was so,⁵⁶ for the choicest among them was Lemech, yet he took

two wives, 'the one named 'Adah - implying that she became pregnant by him⁵⁷ - and the name of the second was Zillah - which implies that she used to sit in his shadow'.")⁵⁸.

That this practice may have been in vogue in talmudic times is indicated by the advice given by Judah the Patriarch to his son not to take a second wife, lest it be rumoured that "the one was his wife, the second his harlot!"⁵⁹. Moreover, if such polygamous unions did exist, they were probably beyond the financial scope of the poorer classes, and were more likely the prerogative of the wealthier elements of the Jewish community.⁶⁰ We would suggest, therefore, that R. Judah's homily above was directed against contemporary abuse of the legal permission to take more than one wife merely as a means of sexual gratification. It is noteworthy that R. Judah b. Simon refers again to this preference of the Antediluvians to indulge in their pleasures rather than to increase their progeny, in connection with a further verse from chapter 24: "(v. 18) לא יכנה דרך (v. 18) לא יכנה דרך, which he interprets as: שלא היתה בעילתם לשם בנין" Their sexual act was not for the purpose of procreation!"⁶¹. This comment, preserved in PT Yebhamoth 6 (7c), appears to be only a fragment of

a much fuller exposition of this verse recorded

anonymously in Genesis Rabbah 30:2:⁶² "אלא תולדות נח"

כתיב "קל הוא על פני המים תקולל חלקתם בארץ לא יפנה דרך כרמים". "קל הוא על פני המים", גזירה נגזרה עליהם שיאבדו במים. "תקולל חלקתם בארץ" - "מי שפרע מדור המבול..." כל כך למה? "לא יפנה דרך כרמים", שלא היתה כוונתן למטעת כרמים. אבל נח לא היתה כוונתו אלא להפרות ולהרבות בעולם ול העמיד בנים שנ' "אלא תולדות נח"

"These are the generations of Noah.....(Gen. 6:9):

קל הוא על פני המים תקולל חלקתם בארץ It is written:

this קל הוא על פני המים, לא יפנה דרך כרמים means, 'It was the decree that they should perish upon the face of the waters!'.⁶³ תקולל חלקתם בארץ.

'Their portion is to be for a curse in the earth', hence the formula, 'May He who exacted punishment

from the Generation of the Flood etc....'.⁶⁴ Why was

this so? Because לא יפנה דרך כרמים, which means that it was not their intention to plant vineyards (i.e.

to procreate).⁶⁵ Noah's intention, however, was to propagate and to multiply in the world and to produce progeny, as it is said, 'These are the Generations of Noah.....'."

R. Judah b. Simon's exposition of Job 24:18 with reference to the Antediluvians' sexual abuses is presupposed in a homily of a northern scholar, R. Jose of Caesarea, according to whom Methuselah tried

vainly to induce the Antediluvians to repent from their evil ways, warning them of the advent of the Flood. However, when the Antediluvians heard that this catastrophe would be delayed until the birth of a favoured one, they resolved to refrain from cohabiting with their wives:⁶⁶ קל מאי דכתיב "קל הוא על פני המים?"⁶⁷ מלמד שהיתה מתושלח הצדיק מתרה בהם בכל יום ואומר להן: חזרו בתשובה, ואם לאו דעו שהקב"ה מביא עליכם מבול ומקפה נבלתכם על המים כזיקין שנ' "קל הוא על פני המים", ולא עוד אלא שלוקחין [מכם] (מהם) קללה לכל באי עולם, שנ' "תקולל חלקתם בארץ". לא יפנה דרך כרמים".⁶⁸ [אמר] (אמר) לו. ומי מעכב? אמר להם: פרידה אחת יש לו (לי) להוציא מכם. אם כן, לא נפנה דרך כרמים.⁷⁰

V. The Antediluvians' Destruction by Fire

The punishment of the Generation of the Flood by fire is a recurring theme in talmudic-midrashic sources, which has been associated almost exclusively with two verses from the Book of Job, 6:17: בעת יזורבו and 22:20: אם לא נכחד קימנו. נצמתו בחמו נדעכו ממקומם. Although this notion is a comparatively late one, found only in amoraic sources, it is nonetheless well-developed, occurring^r in a variety of aggadic settings. In view of our observations above regarding the three cardinal sins of the Antediluvians, it is interesting to note that a fiery doom is

prescribed in our sources for each one of the major crimes which they perpetrated. Thus R. Levi declared with reference to 6:17, that the Antediluvians were consigned to the flames on account of their arrogant denial of Divine Authority.⁷¹ According to an anonymous teacher, whose statement is preserved in an extract of the lost Midrash Yelammedenu, the Antediluvians' punishment by fire, referred to in Job 22:20,^r resulted from their violent acts of robbery.⁷² Of special interest is the following passage where the tradition of the Antediluvians' punishment by fire is based once again on Job 6:17. Although this statement is post-tannaitic, being primarily an aggadic exposition of Mishnah Eduyoth 2:10, it echoes a notion which has its origins in high antiquity. As a result of their unnatural practices and vices, the Antediluvians were likewise subjected to an unnatural punishment

involving the opposing elements of fire and snow: ⁷³

ומה ראית להקיש משפט רשעים בגיהנם למשפט דור המבול?
שכשם שדינם של אלו באש ובשלג, כך דינם של אלו באש
ובשלג. באש מניין? שנ' "בחורמו נדעכו ממקומם". ובשלג
מניין? שנ' "ויהי הגשם על הארץ". ולמה כך? אלא במדה
שאדם מודד בה מודדין לו. ראה מה כתיב, "ויראו בני
האלהים את בנות האדם כי טבת הנה" - אלו הבתולות -
"ויקחו להם נשים" - אלו נשי אנשים - "מכל אשר בחרו" -
אף על הזכר ועל הבהמה.

"For what reason did the author of the Mishnah compare

the punishment of the wicked in Gehinnom to the punishment of the Generation of the Flood? For just as the punishment of the former is by means of fire and snow,⁷⁴ so the punishment of the latter was by means of fire and snow. Whence do we know that they were punished by means of fire? Because it is said, 'Through His fire they were destroyed out of their place (Job 6:17)'. Whence do we know that they were punished by means of snow? Because it is said, 'And the water was on the face of the earth (Gen. 7:12)'.⁷⁵ Why was this so? Because the measure with which a man ^smeasures will be measured out to him!⁷⁶ See what is written concerning them, 'And the sons of the mighty saw the daughters of men that they were goodly (Gen. 6:2)' - this refers to the virgins⁷⁷ - 'and they took wives (ibid.)' - which refers to married women⁷⁸ - 'from wherever they chose (ibid.)' - which implies that they consorted even with males and beasts!''.

In the sources quoted above, the conflagration which came upon the Antediluvians appears as an independent punishment related specifically with their crimes. There are, in addition, one or two passages which suggest that the purpose of the conflagration was merely to reinforce the effects of the deluge in destroying the Generation of the Flood.

Echoing an early tradition that the Antediluvians were a race of giants,⁷⁹ R. Berechiah observes that on account of their size, they would not have succumbed to the flood-waters alone. Therefore God brought down upon them a celestial fire in order to reduce them, as implied in Job 22:20:⁸⁰ א'ר ברכי', קשים היו יתר מדאי ובעלי קומה היו ואילולי שפרע מהן מלמעלה לא היו יכולין להן המים, שכן איוב אמר, "אם לא נחכר קימנו ויתרם אכלה אש". מהו כך? כיון שראה הקב"ה שלא מתו בתהומות שלמטן הוריד עליהן אש שלמעלה ושרפתן, שנ' "אם לא נחכר קימנו ויתרם אכלה אש". R. Berechiah said:

The Antediluvians were exceedingly strong and of great stature, consequently, had not God punished them from above, then the waters alone would not have prevailed against them! Thus Job said 'קימנו ויתרם וגו' (22:20). What does this imply? When God saw that they did not perish in the watery depths from below, He brought down upon them celestial fire and burned them! Thus it is said, 'If they were not destroyed by the waters because of their height,⁸¹ then fire consumed what remained of them (viz. above the waters).'⁸²

In connection with this same verse from Job, the prominent Amora R. Eliezer b. Pedath advances a different notion regarding the supplementary role of the conflagration, which has a polemical colouring. In order to dispel any suggestion that God destroyed

the Generation of the Flood merely to gain possession of their vast wealth, their valuables were consigned to the flames:⁸³ א'ר אלעזר, "אם לא נחכר קימנו", נתחלה אבד הקב'ה את ממונן שלא יהו אומרים, לממוננו הוא צריך".

"R. Eleazar said: It is written, אם לא נכחד קימנו⁸⁴
'Surely their wealth is destroyed!', God began by⁸⁵
destroying their wealth, so that they should not say,
He has need of our money!'.⁸⁵"

Having presented the relevant material, it is necessary to give some consideration to the question of the origin of the tradition that the Generation of the Flood were destroyed by a conflagration as well as a deluge. This notion is clearly without any basis in the pentateuchal account of the Flood, and, as we observed earlier, is of a comparatively late date. Ginzberg has endeavoured to find a very early background for this tradition in the much older concept of the world conflagration (the מכול של אש in rabbinic terminology, corresponding to the מכול של מים) which is destined to engulf the world. As a result of developments within rabbinic theology on the subject of reward and punishment, Ginzberg argues, the notion of an indiscriminate destruction which is ultimately to^t_^ overtake good and bad alike, was no longer consonant

with rabbinic ideology. The notion of a conflagration coinciding with the deluge may have arisen from the efforts of the Rabbis to remove the concept of ⁸⁶ בְּיָמֵי נֹחַ from its eschatological setting to a purely historical one. This hypothesis, however, is rather far-fetched. It is more plausible to presume that this tradition was modelled on the fate of the Sodomites, who are the classical example for a fiery doom. In rabbinic thought there is a close relationship between the Antediluvians and the Sodomites which is reflected in the parallel traditions preserved already in early sources regarding both the nature and causes of their corruption as well as the manner in which they were ultimately punished.⁸⁷ The Amora R. Johanan b. Nappaha explicitly states that both these generations of evil-doers suffered the identical fate, annihilation through a deluge and a conflagration.⁸⁸ We would suggest further that the development of the conflagration theme in connection with the Antediluvians was influenced particularly by the link in rabbinic thought between this mode of punishment and immoral practices.⁸⁹ As is well-known, the Sodomites emerge in rabbinic Aggadah as prototypes for vice, on account of which they were condemned to the flames.⁹⁰ We witness this same tendency in the rabbinic treatment of the Generation

of the Flood. The Antediluvians are similarly portrayed as a scriptural model for all manner of vice, which resulted in their punishment through fire, or heat in some form. This is clearly reflected in the anonymous exposition of Mishnah Eduyoth 2:10 quoted earlier, where the Antediluvians' vices are specifically associated with the punishment of fire.⁹¹ This tendency may be reflected further in a homily of R. Idi who, on the basis of Job 6:18, declared that the Generation of the Flood were seized by flushes of heat on account of their abuse of the natural order.⁹² Similarly, the Babylonian Amora R. Hisda linked the tradition that the Deluge consisted of scalding waters,⁹³ with the sexual crimes of the Antediluvians, declaring that this mode of punishment was symbolic of the hot seminal fluid with which they perpetrated their degenerate acts.⁹⁴

Notes.

1. Cf. I Enoch 8: 2-3, also 65: 6f; II Enoch 34: 1-2 (Recensions A & B).

2. Cf. I Enoch loc. cit., and II Enoch loc. cit.,; also Jubilees 7: 20ff; Sybilla i: 204ff.

3. Cf. sources quoted in preceding note, and particularly Sybilla i, 177-201.

4. Cf. I Enoch loc. cit.,. The Antediluvians' sorcery is referred to only rarely in older rabbinic sources.

We may note, however, that this tradition has been

associated with a verse from Job 24:13: **הָמָּה הָיוּ בַּמּוֹרְדִּי**

אֹר which has been rendered midrashically as "they

were among those who brought down (= **מּוֹרְדִּי**) the

heavenly luminaries," viz. for the purpose of

witchcraft: - **מלמד שהיו מורדין חמה ולבנה ועושין**

כשפים עליהם, הוא שאמר, "המה היו במורדי אור", "המה

הגבורים (השח' בר' ו, 4) "שהיו קשין ומורדין ומכשפין

"ויאמרו לקל סור ממנו..."

(Cf. Tanh. OV. Bereshit 12, which reads **המה היו רואין**

However, the reading **מורדין** - which is suggested by

the proof-text - is supported by a fragment of the

lost Midrash Yelammedenu, published by Wertheimer (cf.

Batei Midrashot Vol. I, p. 148), also by Mayan Gannim

to Job ad. loc. (Ed. Buber, p. 77). This reading is

further confirmed by an extra-European source, Midrash Ha-Gadol to Gen. 6:5 (Ed. Margulies, p. 141), where this Aggadah is recorded in the name of R. Eleazar b. Pedath (see MSS cited by Margulies ad. loc.) who explicitly states: "במורדי אור", אלא "במורדי אור".

5. Cf. Sybilla i, 204ff.

6. Cf. Jubilees loc. cit.,. The term used in Jubilees is "uncleanliness", viz. טומאה, which Ginzberg identifies as טומאת עבודה זרה (defilement through idolatry; cf. "Legends of the Jews" Vol. V, p. 173, note 17), a notion which occurs several times in biblical sources, cf. Ez. 20:7: ובגל ולי מצרים אל (also verse 18).

7. Cf. II Enoch loc. cit., Recension B.

8. Cf. GR 31:6: (Ed. T.A, p. 280) א'ר לוי, "חמס" זה עבודה כוכבים, "חמס" זה גלוי עריות, "חמס" זה שפיכות דמים..... see, however, the material quoted by Ginzberg loc. cit., from later rabbinic sources which refer to five, and even eight transgressions which caused the Flood. In a Baraita from the School of R. Ishmael, cited frequently in Babylonian sources (cf. San. 57a and parallels), two sins are deduced from the verb שח in Gen. 6:11, עבירה ("sexual iniquity")

and עבודה זרה ("idolatry"). Similarly, Josephus refers to two crimes of the Antediluvians, their refusal to pay honour to God (compare the tannaitic source cited above, p. 323), and their failure to practise justice towards men (compare R. Meir's statement above, p. 330)

We may note in conclusion, the "triad" of cardinal sins recorded in the Midrash on the Torah published from the Genizah by Mann (cf. "The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue", p. 150): שהם היו פרוצים:

בגלל ובזנות, בעבירה, בגלל ובזנות. The expression עבירה in this text is obviously a reduplication of זנות. Mann endeavours to remove this difficulty by interpreting

עבירה in this context as idolatry, although he himself realised that this is untenable. It is more plausible to presume that this passage contains a conflation of two distinct readings, a) בגלל ובזנות b) בעבירה ובגלל. The compiler of our text has probably reproduced all three terms, despite the obvious tautology.

9. See above, p. 20, and note 2 ad loc., p. 33.

10. The association between Job's speech in chapter 24 and the Generation of the Flood is indicated by the following passage which echoes the dictum of Judah the Patriarch cited above. An unknown teacher in contrasting the Antediluvians with the Tower-builders

observes that the deeds of the latter remain unexpounded, the criminal conduct of the former is expounded by

Job in chapter 24 (cf. Tanh. Buber I, p. 54; Old

Version, Noah 18): - אתה מוצא מעשה דור המבול נתפרשו, ומעשה דור הפלגה לא נתפרשו, מעשה דור המבול פרשו איוב, שנאמר "גבולות ישיגו עדר גזלו וירעו. חמור יתומים ינהגו (וגו' כ"ד, 2-3)". מהו "גבולות ישיגו"? שהיו נכנסין זה בגבולו של זה, וזה בגבולו של זה, "ועדר גזלו וירעו" - שהיו גוזלים זה צאנו של זה. "חמור יתומים ינהגו" - כשהיו ראויין חמור גיד יתום מיד היו נוטלין אותו ממנו. "יחבלו שור אלמנה" - אלמנה שמת בעלה והניח לה שור אחד ויצאה לרעות אותו, מיד היו נוטלין אותו ממנה. "ערום ילינו מבלי לבוש (שם, 7)" - כיון שראו בני אדם שהיו עושין בהם כך, היו מפשיטין את בגדיהם ומהלכין ערומים.

See further note 34, p. 357 below; also p. 336, and

note 44ad loc., p. 360f. In the above source, only

three verses from chapter 24 appear, 2, 3, and 7:

"גבולות ישיגו עדר גזלו וירעו. חמור יתומים ינהגו יחבלו

"There are that שור אלמנה. ערום ילינו מבלי לבוש"

remove land-marks; they violently take away flocks

and feed them. They drive away the ass of the fatherless

they take the widow's ox for a pledge, They lie all

night naked without clothing,"). However, from

material quoted elsewhere, we see no less than 12

verses from this chapter were applied to the Generation

of the Flood (vv. 2-4, 7, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 27, 29,

and 30). See further my observations below on the

Targum to this chapter, 388ff.

11. Cf ARN Vers. A, 32, p. 93. We may note that R. Akiba also employs a verse from Job 24 in a homily on the Generation of the Flood - once again without indicating the basis for its application to this subject.

According to an incident recorded in GR. 33:5 (Ed. T-A, p. 310), when R. Akiba preached on the destruction of the Antediluvians to the community of Gazaka in Media, his audience remained unmoved until they heard the story of Job which immediately reduced them to tears. Whereupon R. Akiba applied to the Antediluvians Job's words in 24: 20:

דרש ר' עקיבא מעשה דור המבול
בגנוק של מדי ולא בכו, וכיון שהזכיר להם מעשה איוב מיד
בכו, וקרא עליהם המקרא הזה "ישכחו רחם מתקו רמה עוד לא
וגו'..." "ישכחו רחם" הן שכחו רחמי(ם) מן הבריות אף הקדוש
ברוך הוא שיכח רחמיו מהם, "מתקו רמה", שמתקו מהם רמה...

(Theodore regards the reading מעשה איוב - which is supported by almost all manuscripts - as erroneous, and adopts in its place the reading of MS London, and of the emended text of MS Oxford 2, מעשה עוד, which, he argues, is more in keeping with the context in which this incident is recorded. It is conceivable, however, that in linking the story of Job with that of the Antediluvians, R. Akiba was influenced by the tradition associating Job with the Generation of the Flood (For a further exposition of Job 24: 20 with reference to the cruel conduct of the Antediluvians, see

Tanh. B. I, p. 35-6; OV, Noah, 7).

12. See further R. Joshua b. Nehemiah's exposition of Gen. 6:3 in GR 26:6 (Ed. T-A, p. 251): אִין דְּנִין אִין רוחן בעצמן שושר ודם הם (Printed Editions read אִין דְּנִין ; however the above reading is supported by all MSS. See further Lekach Tov on Genesis ad loc., Ed. Buber, p. 33).

13. We have adopted here the fuller text of this homily preserved in a Baraita in San. 108a; see also Mid. Tan., Ed. Hoffmann p. 36, and the parallels cited ad loc.,; also Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai, Ed. Epstein, p. 74.

14. Cf. Marmorstein, "The Background of the Aggadah", HUCA Vol. VI (1929), p. 158ff.

15. Cf. G. Allon, "Toldoth Ha-Yehudim be-Eretz Yisrael bi-Tekufat Ha-Mishnah veHa-Talmud", Vol. II, p. 58.

16. Cf. Mechilta, Beshallach 4, Ed. Friedmann, p. 52b, for the expositions of this verse by R. Joshua b. Hananiah and R. Eliezer; also Ex. R. 26:2 (and parallels cited by Mandelbaum, Pesikta p. 50) for the alternative interpretations offered by R. Judah b. 'Il'ai, R. Nehemiah and their colleagues.

17. שידע כחי ומרד בי (cf. PT Hagigah 2, 77b).
18. "ואם לא תשמעו לי" מה ת'ל? אין לי אלא זה שהוא יודע את רבונו ומתכחן למרוד בו. (cf. Sifra on Leviticus ad loc., Ed Weiss, p. 111a).
19. הללו מכירין וכופרין, הללו אין מכירין וכופרין (cf. Shabbat 116a).
20. Cf. GR. 36:1 (Ed. T-A, p. 334); also Lev. R. 5:1 (Ed. Margulies, p. 98f); Yalkut Job 908.
21. This reading is supported by almost all the manuscripts cited by Theodor ad loc.,.
22. So Lev. R., and all the manuscripts quoted by Margulies ad loc.; also Yalkut; similarly MSS Vatican and Stuttgart read ב'לון, however, all other MSS of Genesis Rabbah and printed editions read כ'לה or כ'לה. R. Meir's imagery, as Lieberman has observed, has been drawn from contemporary practices in the Roman courts (Cf. 'Roman Legal Institutions in early Rabbinics and in the Acta Matyrium', JQR 35 (1944-5) p. 17ff.
23. In connection with this verse, see above p. 34, n. 3.
24. The passage at this point contains a collection of aggadic expositions based on Job 21:8ff, which are

evidently a later interpolation into the text. In its original form, this passage probably contained only a series of verses from Job 21, like the anonymous tannaitic passage quoted earlier (above, p. 323f).

25. So MSS Paris and Stuttgart; the imperfect is more in keeping with the hypothetical statement of this type, which is a feature of early rabbinic diatribes (see the examples quoted by Marmorstein, *op. cit.*, HUCA VI, 1929, p. 192ff).

26. Cf. ARN *loc. cit.*, p. 93. Presumably R. Meir has taken Gen. 6:3, not as God's own words, but as the declaration of the Antediluvians reported by God: "And the Lord said: They have said of Me 'My spirit will not judge man forever!'" See further the exposition of this verse recorded in the name of R. Judah the Patriarch, in GR 26:6 (ed. T-A, p. 252); also the alternative exposition of this verse by R. Meir, above p. 330, and note 32 *ad loc* (below, p. 356).

27. See above, p. 323, where R. Akiba's statement is made once again in connection with Gen. 6:3.

28. Cf GR *loc. cit.*, on Ps. 10:13; see also Midrash Psalms on this verse (ed. Buber, p. 95) where this statement is recorded anonymously in a longer form,

clearly echoing the words of R. Meir: לית דיין וליה

! see דיין, הניח הקב"ה את עולמו והלך וישב לו בשמים.
further PK 8, p. 68b (ed. Mandelbaum p. 135 for
parallels) where the Amora, R. Shimon b. Isaac asserts
that the heretical notion of לית דיין וליה דיין, implied
in Eccles. 11:9, might have led to the exclusion of
this book from the Cannon.

29. Cf. Ex. R. 30:13; see also Tanh. B. I, p. 55, where
the Generation of the Flood are compared to a prince
who declares to his royal father איני יכול לעמוד בך
ולא בסריחותיך.

30. Cf. above, p. 34, note 3.

31. Cf. GR 26:6 (ed. T-A, p. 252). On the notion of
מדה כנגד מדה in connection with the Generation of
the Flood, see the tannaitic Aggadah quoted above,
p.324, and particularly the anonymous exposition of
'Eduyoth 2:10, above p. 342, also the material cited in
note below.

32. We have taken R. Meir's words, which are presumably
an exposition of Gen 6:3, לא ידון דוחי באדם as an
affirmative statement, like that of R. Hanina (above,
p. 332), against Theodor's explanation ad loc.,.

33. Cf. GR 31:5 (ed. T-A, p. 279).

34. We note in this context the lengthy and detailed description of the Antediluvians' violent and illicit conduct preserved in a midrashic fragment from the Cairo Genizah, published by Schechter as part of the lost Midrash Yelammedenu (cf. "Studies in Jewish Literature in Honour of Kohler", p. 262). On the basis of a series of verses from Job 24 which, as we observed earlier (above note 10), was closely associated with the corrupt conduct of the Antediluvians, an anonymous teacher elaborates upon the social corruption and dishonesty of this wicked generation:

....ה' צדיק יבחן וגו'.... ימטר על רשעים פחים (תה' י'א, 5-6) "ה' צדיק יבחן" - זה נח שדבקו האי'ם ומצאו צדיק שנ' "איש צדיק תמים היה (בר' ו, 9) "ורשע ואוהב חמס (שנאה נפשו", תה' שם), זה דור המבול שהיו כולך גוזלין זה את זה ורודפין אחרי החמס שנ' "ויאמר אלקים לנח קץ כל בשר בא לפני (בר' שם, 13) "היה לאחד מהם שדה והיה לחברו שדה אצלה, והיה נוטל קימעה קימעה מן התחום עד שהיה נוטל אותה, שנ' "גבולות ישיגו (וגו' אי' כ'ד, 2) "וכן היה לאדם צאן והיה חברו הולך ולוקח אחד אחד עד שהיה נוטל את כל העדר, שנ' "עדר גזלו וירעו (שם) "וכן היה יתום עני לוקח לו שיח אחד משהיה מגדלו היה אחד בא ונוהגו הימנו שנ' "חמור יתומים ינהגו (וגו', שם 3) "וכן היתה אשה אלמנה לוקחת לה עגל אחד ומגדלתו ומי שהיה נעשה שור היה בא אחד ונוטלו הימנה, שנ' "יחבלו שור אלמנה (שם, שם) "כך עני בא ליכנס לדין והיו מטין את דינו שנ' "יסו אביונים מדרך (שם, 4) ".

35. Cf. "The Political and Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris in the Second and Third

Centuries", p. 43ff. It is possible that the abuse of the poorer members of the Jewish community by wealthier coreligionists, particularly in money matters (see Buchler op. cit., p. 42-3, and note 2 ad loc.) is reflected in the following Aggadah preserved in GR 31:4 (ed. T-A, p. 297), based upon Job 35:9: מרוב עשוקים מרוב עשוקים יזעיקו ישועו מזרוע רבים According to an anonymous teacher, it was the interclass strife which ultimately sealed the fate of the Antediluvians. The powerful - indicated in the above verse by the expression זרוע - abused the oppressed in monetary matters, while the latter retaliated with violence of speech. The imagery employed in this homily is reminiscent of the terminology employed by R. Pinhas b. Ya'ir, who complains of the eclipse of the scholars and of free men through the emergence of the בעלי זרוע ובעלי לשון ("violent and insolent men"; cf Sotah 49a): "מרוב עשוקים יזעיקו", אלו הנעשקים, "ישועו מזרוע רבים", אלו העושקים. אלו רבים על אלו, אלו רבים על אלו, אלו רבים על אלו בחימוס ממון, ואלו רבים על אלו בחימוס דברים עד שנחתם גזר דינם. ("Amid their contentiousness (= מריב) the oppressed (= עשוקים) cry out [audaciously]', refers to the oppressed; 'while they cry out on account of their might quarrelling [with the poor] (= רבים), refers to the oppressors. Thus both the oppressed and the oppressors quarrelled with each other, the former with

the latter on account of their violence in money matters, and the latter with the former on account of their violence in speech, until their fate was sealed!").

36. Cf. GR 27:3 (Ed. T-A, p. 257); also PT Ma'aseh Sheni 5,55d; San. 109a; Yalkut Job 909.

37. This reading, suggested by Luria ad loc., on the basis of PT Hagigah, is supported by MS Oxford 2, and Yalkut.

38. This reading is supported by both MSS Oxford and early printed editions. That the three hundred robberies referred to in the text were a direct result of the sermon, is indicated particularly in the version of this story in San. 109a, where the preacher concerned is R. Jose, who is confronted by the inhabitants of Sepphoris with the charge of having

דרש ר' יוסי בצפורי, - 'shown the way to thieves':-
אחתיך ההוא ליליא תלה מאה מחתרתא בצפורי. אתו וקא
מצערי ליה, אמרו ליה, יהבית אורחיה לגנביה! אמר להו,
מי הוה ידענא דאתו גנבי?

39. Op. cit., p. 46ff.

40. See the statements of R. Hiyya, R. Simlai, R. Jose and Bar Kappara in Lev. R. 23:9 (Ed. Marg. p. 538ff); also GR. 26:5 (Ed. T-A, p. 248-9, and parallels cited ad. loc.).

41. Cf. Lev. R. and GR. loc. cit.,
42. Cf. Sifra on Lev. 18:3 (Ed. Weiss, p. 85b).
43. Ed. Zuckerman, p. 463.
44. 2:1.
45. This last statement may shed some light upon an enactment ascribed to R. Jose b. Halaphta on his arrival in Sepphoris, that a boy should not walk behind his mother in the street (cf. San. 19a). According to Rashi ad loc., this injunction was to protect the mother from abuse which might result from the kidnapping of the child. It is equally probable, however, that R. Jose's concern was for the protection of the child himself.
46. Cf. Eliahu Rabbah 31 (Ed. Friedmann, 29, p. 158, and parallels cited ad loc.), and particularly Targ. Ps. Jonathan to Gen. 6:2; see further the description by R. Meir of the Generations of Kain in PRE 22 (also R. Judah the Patriarch's comment ad loc.). Friedlander's suggestion (cf. his translation of PRE, p. 158, note 7) that this passage may refer to an obscure Christian sect, is questionable. It is more plausible to presume that R. Meir's comments presuppose the practices of the Graeco-Roman world. See also the

passage cited above (note 10-, where this tradition appears in an adapted form, the oppressed members of the Generation of the Flood stripping off their garments to avoid their seizure by their nefarious contemporaries. We may note in conclusion, that the tradition referred to in these sources is echoed already in the Book of Jubilees (7:20), where Noah is depicted as admonishing his children against the uncovering of their flesh. Ginzberg suggests that the uncovering of the flesh in this context may only be an inaccurate translation of an original Hebrew גִּלּוּי עֲרִוּה (viz. "unchastity", cf. "The Legends of the Jews", V, p. 193, note 67). However, in view of the general attitude on this subject expressed by the author of Jubilees (cf. 3:30, where he refers to the prohibition against uncovering oneself after the fashion of the gentiles, as being inscribed on "the heavenly tablets" - viz. of the highest authority), we may presume that the uncovering of the flesh in this passage is to be taken in its literal sense.

47. Compare above, p. 323.

48. So Yalkut Job 909.

49. For an explanation of this midrashic rendering of Job 24:18, see below, note 63.

50. Cf. I Mac. 1:11ff; II Mac. 4:9ff; see also Josephus: Antiquities, XII, 5, 1.

51. Cf. ARN Vers. A, 26, ed. Schechter p. 82, and parallels cited ad loc.,.

52. See Buchler op. cit., p. 48. Buchler is unable to deduce any conclusive evidence to show that the censures uttered by the Rabbis on the subject of immorality, were aimed exclusively at the wealthy. However, such evidence is contained in the following statement of R. Shimon b. Yohai, who, in commenting on the immoral conduct of the בני האלהים (Gen. 6:2, interpreted by him as the "sons of the judges"), declares: "Licentiousness which does not proceed from the great, is no real licentiousness! (כל פרצה שאינה מגדולים ; cf. GR 26:5, ed. T-A, p. 247)".

It is conceivable that he was alluding to the conditions which actually prevailed in his native Galilee.

53. Cf. GR 23:2 (ed. T-A, p. 222-3).

54. Although this reading is an appropriate one, it is found in none of the MSS of Genesis Rabbah, the majority of which read, בהיה (= 'during her own lifetime'; MSS Oxford 1 and 2 read ביהיה, so Rashi

on Gen. 4:19). Our reading, however, occurs in the Aruch and Mayan Gannim to Job ad loc., v. 24, (ed. Buber, p. 79), and is substantiated further by the extra-European source, Midrash ha-Gadol (on Genesis ad loc., ed. Marg. p. 125-6).

55. Presumably R. Judah has taken לֹא תֵלֵד , as a sifa construction, as a final clause, 'that she should not bear'.

56. Or, "the strongest", see Lieberman's comments on the expression תָּרַב and cognate forms in talmudic-midrashic sources ("Greek in Jewish Palestine", p. 51, note 122); also Zulay's observations on the meaning of תָּרַב in the writings of the early poet Yannai ("Iyyunei Lashon be-Phiyyutei Yannai", Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem VI, 1945, pp. 178-9). The reading תָּרַב is supported by both MSS Oxford, Yalkut and early printed editions. MS Stuttgart reads תָּרַבָּהּ, and MS Munich, תָּרַבָּהּ, both readings are probably explanatory glosses for the more unusual תָּרַב.

57. Connecting עָרָה with the Aramaic עָרָה, "to carry", hence, "to become pregnant".

58. Connecting עָרָה with עָרָה (cf. Rashi on Gen. ad loc.).

59. נִינְסִיב אַתְחָא אַחֲרֵיתִי, יֹאמְרוּ זֶה אֲשֶׁתּוֹ זֶה זִוְנָתוֹ (כתוב' ס' ב. ע' ב.).

60. Cf. S.W. Baron, "A Social and Religious History of the Jews", II p. 223ff; L. M. Epstein, "Marriage Laws in the Bible and the Talmud", p. 17; on the subject of polygamy in Palestine during the Rabbinic period, see further S. Lowy, "The extent of Jewish Polygamy in Talmudic Times", JJS IX, p. 115ff.
61. For an explanation of R. Judah's exposition of Job 24:18, cf. note 65 below.
62. Ed. T-A, p. 270-1, for parallels.
63. קל has been equated with גזירה, "a decree", on the basis of Dan. 4:28, קל מן שמיא נפל (cf. the MS commentary on Genesis Rabbah quoted by Theodor ad loc., also the MS Paris, where this proof-text from Daniel is actually quoted in the main text).
64. For the full text of this formula, cf Mishnah Babha Metziah 4:2: מי שפרע מאנשי דור המבול ומדור הפלגה . On the exposition of the phrase קל הוא על פני המים, see further the homily of R. Jose of Caeserea, above p. 341.
65. The interpretation of the phrase, דרך כרמים as an allusion to sexual intercourse is implied in several sources quoted above, which refer to the Antediluvians' unwillingness to propagate. However,

none of these sources indicates how this phrase was made to yield to such a meaning. We may note that the use of the verb נטע - as in the above phrase, למטע, כרמים in the sense of "to procure young", has its parallels in rabbinic literature (cf. PT Yebhamoth i, 2b: וחמש נטיעות נטע). This alone however, does not shed any light on the exposition of Job 24:18. We would suggest, therefore, that in all the above sources the expression כרם has been invested with the meaning of "a woman" (compare the rendering of Targum Ps. Jonathan and the fragmentary Targum to Nu. 20;17: לא נשרגנא בתולין.... :לא נעבור בשדה ובכרם "We will not set upon the virgins....nor will we violate married women"; see also Targ. Ps. Jonathan to Nu. 21:22) Another agricultural term which, like כרם and שדה, has been invested with the meaning of "a woman", is the expression גן, cf PRE 21: אין גן אלא אשה. As to the term דרך, this has been taken as an alternative for the expression ביאה, "sexual intercourse", as is explicitly stated in Kid. 26: ביאה איקרי "דרך", "Intercourse is termed דרך". Consequently the phrase לא יפנה דרך כרמים, is to be understood as, "They did not turn to intercourse with women!".

66. Cf San. 108a-b; also Midrash ha-Gadol to Gen.

6:13 (ed. Margulies, p. 155-6).

67. The reading *מחושלח* for *נח* in printed editions, occurs in MS Munich, also a MS of the Yalkut (cited by Rabbino-wicz, *סופרים* ad loc.). and was accepted also by Meir Abulafia (cf Yad Ramah on San. ad loc.). This reading is further confirmed by extra-European source, Midrash ha-Gadol. We may note, however, that the reading *נח* was known to Rashi, who regarded the expression *פרידה אחת*, as an allusion to Methuselah, rendering *להוציא מכם* as "to take away from you (viz. removing Methuselah from the world prior to the advent of the Flood)". In the light of rabbinic traditions relating to Noah and Methuselah, Rashi's interpretation is not without some foundation. Noah appears in both rabbinic and non-rabbinic traditions as the preacher or "herald", admonishing his generation (cf GR 30:7, ed. T-A, p. 273, where, on the basis of Job 12:5: *לפיד בור בעשתות שאנן*, Noah is depicted as the herald - *כרז* - to his generation. The identical term, KEROUX = *כרז*, is used to designate Noah in II Peter 2:5 - see Greek and Syriac versions); see further the material quoted by Ginzberg, "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 174, note 19, also p. 177, note 25; also J.P. Lewis, "A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and

Christian Literature", p. 27, 33, and 102, note 3). Similarly the notion that Methuselah was spared the experience of the Flood is echoed in the anonymous aggadah that he died seven days prior to the advent of the deluge (cf GR 32:7, ed. T-A, p. 293). Nonetheless, the rendering of להוציא as "to take away", as suggested by Rashi, is untenable, as it cannot be supported by any parallel examples in our sources. On the contrary, this same terminology occurs again in BK 38b, where it clearly refers to the bringing forth of those yet to be born:

שתי פרידות טובות יש לי להוציא מהן, דות המואביה ונעמה

העמונית . It is interesting to note that Rashi was aware of the tradition of Methuselah's role as a preacher (cf his comment on Job 24:18, where he quotes an unidentified aggadic source known also to Masnuth - cf Mayan Gannim on Job ad loc., ed. Buber, p. 78; also Yashar Noah, 14a-b). See further Rashi's rather forced interpretation of דרך כרמים, San., ad loc..

68. See above, note 63.

69. Printed editions contain the following obscure comment on this clause, not found in any manuscript, or Midrash ha-Gadol, unknown to Rashi or Meir Abulafia, and already deleted by the Vilna Gaon: מלמד שהיו מפנים דרך כרמים.

70. See above, p. 364f, note 65.

71. Cf Lev. R. 7:6; see also Tanh. B. III, p. 13 (OV, Zaw 2, where both Job 6:17 and 22:20 are cited as proof-texts); Yalkut Samuel 161 (where 22:20 alone is cited); Midrash Ps. to 11:6 (ed. Buber, p. 100). The following passage is part of a lengthy homily by R. Levi who, in connection with Lev. 6:2 (הוא העולה על מוקדה, which he renders as "whoso goeth up - viz. behaves arrogantly - is set upon the conflagration") adduces a number of biblical examples to illustrate the notion that arrogance and blasphemy incur the punishment of fire: א'ר לוי: דור... המבול על ידי שנתגאו ואמרו, מה שדי כי נעבדנו ומה נועיל כי נפגע בו, לא נידונו אלא באש, שנ' בעת יזרבו נצמתו. בחמו נדעכו ממקומם. The text as reproduced here,

is supported by all MSS to Lev. R. (see ed. Marg. ad loc., p. 161). In printed editions, and in a Genizah fragment cited by Margulies loc. cit., the following exposition of Job 6:17, clause B, is included: ... בעת: יזרבו נצמתו - אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: זריבתן לחלוטין (בעת יזרבו נצמתו) היתה, כד' א' לצמיתה לקנה."

R. Joshua b. Levi said: This implies that their incineration was to be forever! נצמתו having the same meaning as לצמיתה לקנה (Lev. 25:30; 'and the house...') shall belong forever to him who bought it' (see both Targumim to Lev. ad loc., which render לצמיתה as לחלוטין)."). By rendering זריבה as incineration, it is possible to

associate R. Joshua b. Levi's exposition of Job 6:17 with R. Levi's Aggadah. It is more plausible, however, to connect R. Joshua's comment with R. Johanan b. Nappaha's statement (Lev. R. ad loc.) that the Generation of the Flood were punished by scalding water (see below, note 93). Consequently, the phrase זריבתן לחלוטין היתה is to be rendered as "Their scalding (their punishment by scalding water) was to be forever!". Ginzberg (cf "Mabul shel-Esh", ha-Goren VIII, p. 46ff) suggests that the expression אש in R. Levi's Aggadah - as in other sources which he cites - is an intentional substitution for אש מבול של אש, a concept which had become theologically unacceptable in rabbinic circles, (See above, p. 345ff). However, R. Levi's homily may well reflect Rabban Gamliel's view that to give offence to the Divine Glory, which is a "fire consuming fire", incurs the punishment of fire (PRE 53):

.... וראה הקב"ה שהלשינו
(ישראל) בכבודו, וכבודו הוא אש אוכלת אש, ושלח בהם אש
ואכלה אותם סביב.....

72. Cf Yalkut Isaiah 508: חקדח אש חמסים מים תבעה אש, "דור המבול שהיו חומסים, נידונו באש, דכת' כי מלאה הארץ חמס", וכתוב "אם לא נכחד קימנו ויחרם אכלה אש".

On חמס, the evasive acts of robbery perpetrated by the Antediluvians, see R. Hanina's homily above, p. 332.

73. Cf Tanh. B. I, p. 23, and the parallels cited by Buber ad loc..

74. Cf Tanh. OV Bereshith 12 (end). Our passage above is preceded in Tanhuma Buber by a graphic description of the suffering to which the wicked are subjected in fire and snow (see further PK ed. Friedmann, p. 97b, also the parallels cited by Mandelbaum, p. 165; also note 76, below).

75. Presumably this is based upon the implication of the phrase $\text{וַיִּהְיֶה...עַל הָאָרֶץ}$, viz. the water remained upon the earth, in the form of snow.

76. The notion that fire and snow are reserved for those who indulge in unnatural vices, has a very early background. Enoch is shown the place of torment in the Third Heaven, where he sees fire, frost and snow, and is informed that this place is reserved particularly for those "who dishonour God and sin against nature, which is child corruption after the Sodomite fashion (II Enoch 10:1-6; see also Testament of Levi 3:2)". It is possible that this notion of the conflicting elements as a punishment of the wicked, was inspired by the third plague brought upon the Egyptians, hail mingled with fire (cf Ex. 9:24).

We may note that the above passage, in relating the punishment of the Antedeluvians to their degenerate conduct, reflects a tendency which occurs already in earliest rabbinic sources. Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai

accounted for the duration of the flood in terms of the Antediluvians' adulterous behaviour (cf GR 32:5, ed. T-A, p.292). In the following generation, both R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos and R. Joshua b. Hananiah declared that, because the Generation of the Flood perverted their actions, God changed the cosmic order to bring about the deluge (cf Baraitha in RH 11b-12a). In a Baraitha from the School of R. Ishmael, the waters of the flood are likened to the seminal fluid with which the Generation of the Flood sinned (see below, note 94). In a similar vein, the Amora R. Levi declared that just as the Antediluvians employed their seminal ducts degenerately, so God changed the natural order in bringing about the flood (GR 32:7, p. 294). Finally, according to the Tanna R. Jose b. Durmaskith, the flood-waters issued from the upper and the lower regions, on account of the Antediluvians' sinning with their upper and their nether "eyes" (cf Sifre Deut. 43, ed. Friedmann, p. 81a; Midrash Tannaim, ed. Hoffmann p. 36; Mechilta Shirah 2, ed. Friedmann, p. 35b; compare also the different version of R. Jose's statement in GR 32:7 (and the parallels cited by Theodor ad loc., p. 294); see also R. 'Idi's statement cited below, note 92.).

77. Cf GR 26:5, ed. T-A, p. 248, on the basis of which the text here is emended.

78. Taking נשא in this context in the more restricted

meaning of ש'א נשא.

79. See Ginzberg, "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 172, note 13.

80. Tanh. B. I, p. 36.

81. Associating קימו with קומה , "height".

82. See further PRE 22 (end), where the Antediluvians boast that on account of their great height, the waters of the flood would only reach their necks, consequently, God destroyed them with boiling water; cf R. Johanan b. Nappaha's Aggadah below, note 93.

83. Cf GR 28:7, ed. T-A, p. 266.

84. For the basis of R. Eleazar's rendering of קימו as wealth, compare his exposition of the expression יקום (Deut. 11:6), in Pesah. 119a: זה ממונו של אדם שמעמידו על רגליו.

85. This statement of R. Eleazar b. Pedath, who was active in the third century, was directed against the notion current in Marcionite circles of his day, that the Demiurgos is desirous of word¹ly possessions (cf the Clementine Homilies II, 48f; also Marmorstein, "The Background of the Aggadah", op. cit., p. 173f).

86. Cf Ginzberg, "Mabul shel-Esh", op. cit., p. 45ff,

and particularly p. 51 (additional note to p. 49).

87. It is of particular interest to note that the three cardinal sins of the Antediluvians enumerated by R. Levi, idolatry, immorality and bloodshed (above, p. 349, note 8), are also ascribed to the Sodomites by an anonymous teacher on the basis of Gen. 13:13 (cf PT San. x, 29c; also ARN Vers. A, 12, p. 52, and the sources cited by Schechter ad loc.): "וְאִנְשֵׁי סְדוֹם רָעִים וְחַטָּאִים לֵה' מְאֹד" "רָעִים" - אֵלֹהִים לֹאֵלֹהִים, "וְחַטָּאִים" - בְּגִלּוֹי עֲרִיוֹת, "לֵה' מְאֹד" - בְּשִׁפְיָכוֹת דְּמִים. Compare also the Tannaitic sources cited above, note 15, where the Sodomites are enumerated along with the Generation of the Flood, the Tower-Builders etc., as examples for overbearing arrogance. It is to be noted that in these sources, just as Job 21 is associated with the conditions of the Antediluvians, so 28:5ff is taken as a description of the Sodomites' social injustice and illicit dealings. See also San 109a-b, which contains a description of the Sodomites' corrupt conduct markedly similar to the Antediluvians' lawlessness, actually based on the same verses from Job (24:2f, and 16; compare above, p. 357, note 34). See further Ginzberg, "The Legends of the Jews" V, p. 238, note 155. We may note further that the association between these two wicked generations is reflected also in the writings of Philo who classifies the crimes of both the Antediluvians and the Sodomites

as "navery, injustice and other vices", which resulted in their destruction through unparalleled punishments by means of the "most forceful elements of the universe.... fire and water (cf "Life of Moses" II, x, 53)". Moreover, Philo speaks of "repeated destructions by fire and water (loc. cit. xlvii, 263)", which is reminiscent of the rabbinic tradition that the Antediluvians and the Sodomites were subjected to both a deluge and a conflagration (see next note). See further Mishnah San. 10:3, where the Sodomites, like the Antediluvians, are consigned to eternal oblivion; also Mechilta d'R. Shimon b. Yohai to Ex. 14:21 (ed. Epstein, p. 61), where the punishment of both the Antediluvians and the Sodomites is deduced from the same proof-text, Job 4:19:

וכן אתה
מוצא באנשי מבול ובאנשי סדום שלא נפרע מהם אלא ברוח
קדים, שנאמר "מנשמת קלוח יאבדו - זה דור המבול - ומרוח
אפו יכלון" - אלו אנשי סדום.

88. Cf GR 27:3 (ed. T-A, p. 257 for parallels).

89. Cf the statement of R. Shimon b. Yohai in Mishnah San. 9:3: אמר להם ר' שמעון: אילו לא היתה שריפה חמורה, ...
...לא ניתנה לבת כהן שונתה... Compare also Tanh. B. I, p. 93 (OV, wa-Yera' 9), where the following comment is added:
ראה כמה קשה הזנות שהיא בשרפה. To illustrate this, R. Joshua b. Nehemiah (ad loc.) cites the example of the Sodomites: אף הסדומים לפי שפרצו בזנות נתחייבו שרפה.

90. On the immorality of the Sodomites, see the sources cited by Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, V, p. 238, note 155; see further GR 50:5 (ed. T-A, p. 522) on Gen. 19:5, and compare Targum Ps. Jonathan *ad loc.*.

91. Cf above, p. 342. It is significant that the themes of the Antediluvians' destruction by fire and the detailed descriptions of their immorality, are both features of amoraic Aggadah. We would suggest, therefore, that the concurrent development of these two notions in rabbinic thought may be inter-related.

92. Cf Tanh. B. I, p. 24; also the Yelammedenu fragment published by Ginzberg, in "Ginzei Schechter" I, p. 37; see further GR 26:5 (ed. T-A, p. 248), and Lev, R. 23:9 (ed. Marg., p. 539): א'ר הונא בשם ר' אידי: לא נחתם גזר דינם של דור המבול עד שכתבו גמוסיות (קמיסמסין) לזכר ולבהמה, לפיכך באו עליהן חמים כמין אשה, שנ' "ילפתו ארחות דרכם", ואין "ילפתו" אלא אשה, שנ' "ויחרד האיש וילפת והנה אשה", ואין "ארחות" אלא נשים, שנ' "אורח כנשים", וכן "דרכם" שנאמר "כי דרך נשים לי"..... ("R. Huna said in the name of R. 'Idi: The fate

of the Generation of the Flood was not sealed until they wrote marriage contracts (=GAMOS; cf Margulies on Lev. R. *ad loc.*) to males and beasts! Consequently, flushes of heat came upon them like women, as it is said, ילפתו

ארחות דרכם (lit. "the caravans that travel by the way of them that turn aside"; Job 6:18), the expression ילפתו

connotes a woman, as it is said, ויחרד האיש וילכת והנה (lit. "the man trembled and turned himself, and behold a woman"; Ruth 3:8); similarly, the expression ארחות connotes women, as it is said, (lit. "after the manner of women"; Gen. 18:11); also דרכם connotes a woman, as it is said, (lit. "for the manner of women is upon me"; ibid., 31:35).").

93. In Palestinian sources, this tradition is associated with the name of R. Johanan b. Nappaha, who found a basis for this notion in Job 6:17, בחמו נדעכו ממקומם (cf PT San. x, 29b; Lev. R. 7:6; also GR 28:9, ed, T-A, p. 267):

„בחמו נדעכו ממקומם": מהו „בחמו"? ברותחין. א'ר יוחנן:
כל טיפה וטיפה שהיה הקב"ה מוריד עליהן היה מרתיחה בתוך
גיהנם ומורידה עליהן, הדא הוא דכתיב „בחמו נדעכו ממקומם".

(„What does בחמו mean? It implies that the Generation of the Flood were punished by scalding water (taking בחמו as בחמימיו, cf Shab. 55b; PT AZ iv, 44b; also Targum on Job ad loc., PRE 22 end, and Luria ad loc.). R. Johanan said: Every drop of water which God brought down upon the Antediluvians, He first heated it in Gehinnom, and then brought it down upon them, as it is said, 'Through His hot water they were annihilated out of their place'."). It is worthy of note that R. Johanan saw in the "hot springs of Tiberias" - the city of his residence - a remnant of the "fountains of the mighty deep" referred to in Gen. 8:2 (cf San. 108a).

94. Cf RH 12a; the wording of R. Hisda's statement is supported by San. 108a (according to MSS Munich and Florence), Yalkut Job 910, and is confirmed by Midrash ha-Gadol to Gen. 8:1 (ed. Marg., p. 175), while printed editions of Sanhedrin (also Zebh. 113b) preserve a shorter form of this statement: ברוותחין קלקלו, וברותחין נידונו, ברוותחין קלקלו - בעבירה - וברותחין נידונו, כתיב הכא "וישכו המים (ברא' ח' 1)", וכתיב התם "וחמם המלך שכבה (אסתר ז' 10)".

It is to be noted that this association between the flood-waters and the seminal fluid, occurs already in a tannaitic source, a Baraitha from the School of R. Ishmael. On the basis of Job 12:5, the waters of the flood are described as 'harsh (i.e. hot and thick - see Rashi ad loc.) like seminal fluid': מימי המבול קשים (San. 108b. In printed editions, this Baraitha is recorded anonymously (תנא), however, the reading תנא דבי ר' ישמעאל occurs in MS Flor. and is confirmed by Yalkut and Midrash ha-Gadol loc. cit.

CHAPTER VI: THE TARGUM TO JOB

I. General Observations

Although the contents of the Targum to Job, and the question of its origin and dating have been discussed by Bacher¹ and Churgin,² neither of these scholars was able to evaluate its contents in the light of a detailed analysis of the aggadic exegesis of the Book of Job in talmudic-midrashic literature. From our own analysis above, we have shown that the exegesis of the Book of Job was determined primarily by the notion that the drama of Job was both enacted and recorded against the background of the exodus and Israel's history in the wilderness. Consequently the book was naturally regarded in rabbinic circles as a supplement to the incidents and events recorded in the Pentateuch.³ Although the Targum's aggadic content is relatively sparse, there is sufficient material to show that its translator was clearly influenced by the same principles underlying the exegesis of the book in rabbinic literature. The scattered and apparently disconnected allusions preserved both in the main text and in the variant renderings of the Targum

constitute an almost complete list of the important personalities and incidents recorded in the Pentateuch, prominence being given particularly to the theme of Israel's experiences in the wilderness.⁴ If, as Bacher suggests, the aggadic material in the Targum was originally more extensive, then it is conceivable that in its original form, the Targum may have consisted of sustained allegorical interpretations of whole sections of the Book of Job in terms of pentateuchal history, as we actually find in the rendering of Job 5:12-15, and 20-23.⁵

Although the Targum contains material which has its parallels only in amoraic sources, a number of its renderings preserve very early aggadic traditions, in some cases dating back to pre-Christian times. It is noteworthy that two of its renderings coincide with expositions by R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos⁶ and R. Akiba⁷ who were active in Yabneh at the period when the original Targum to Job made its reappearance.⁸ Possibly these two renderings preserved in our existing text are a remnant of the original Targum, and as such, are not merely a reflection of tannaitic Aggadah, but the actual source upon which

R. Eliezer and R. Akiba based their Aggadoth. Some support for this assumption is to be found in one of the cosmogonic discussions quoted earlier, where R. Eliezer bases his view that the waters of creation were absorbed by the primordial sea on the rendering of an ancient Targum to Job 38:16.⁹ The possibility of some relationship between the original Targum to Job and the aggadic exegesis of the book is suggested further by a remarkable coincidence which has not been noted hitherto. From the numerous statements by scholars of the pre-Bar Cochba period cited above, it is clear that the main trends in the exegesis of the Book of Job in rabbinic circles have their origins in the circle of scholars at Yabneh,¹⁰ among whom the original Targum to Job came to light once more. Assuming that this Targum was more aggadic in character, as Bacher contends, then it is conceivable that its reappearance gave fresh impetus to the aggadic interpretation of the Book of Job, determining the pattern of its exegesis among subsequent generations of scholars.

A further piece of evidence linking the Targum with the scholars of Yabneh is

preserved in the alternative rendering to Job 30:19,
 -:הַרְנִי לַחֲמֹר וְאַחֲמֹשׁל כְּעֹפֹר וְאֶפֶר

"Compare me to Adam who was	אֶקְשׁוּ יְהִי לְאָדָם
created from mire, and I	דְּאֲתִבְרָא מִן טִינָא
shall be like Abraham who	וְאַחֲמֹתִיל לְאַבְרָהָם
was likened to dust and	דְּאָדָמִי לְעֹפֹר
ashes!".	וְקָטָם.

In the case of this rendering it is possible to substantiate Bacher's contention regarding the antiquity of such alternative translations.¹¹ For the notion that Job was comparable with Adam and Abraham is an early one, compatible with the attitude towards Job in tannaitic times, but completely contrary to the opinions expressed in amoraic sources. As we have shown elsewhere, early in the tannaitic period when Job, as a prototype for martyrdom, was esteemed as an *עוֹבֵד מֵאֲהָבָה*, his religious motives were equated with those of Abraham.¹² Similarly, we find Job mentioned favourably in the same context as Adam in statements by teachers of this same period. Like Adam, Job was born¹³ circumcised, he restricted himself to a monogamous union,¹⁴ and was willing to accept

comfort for the loss of his children.¹⁵ In one significant passage, probably reflecting very early traditions, although preserved in a late source, Job and Adam are enumerated among the seven patriarchs of the world.¹⁶ In amoraic sources these attitudes are completely reversed, any favourable association between Job and Abraham on the one hand, and Job and Adam on the other, is emphatically denied, and any suggestion that Job might have shared the status of the patriarchs or Adam, is rejected on account of his failure to withstand Divine visitation.¹⁷ It is particularly interesting to note that Job 30:19, which is rendered in the Targum cited above as an affirmation of Job's equality with Abraham, was interpreted by the Amora R. Berachiah as a declaration that, although Job might compare himself to Abraham, in God's eyes he was no better than the Generation of the Tower-builders!¹⁸

Consequently, we can assume that the alternative rendering quoted above predates that contained in the main text, and may have formed part of the original Targum to Job which was still current among the early Tannaim, and as such, may only be a fragment of more extensive aggadic material which

portrayed Job in a favourable light as we find him in early sources. However, with the decline in attitude towards Job among the Amoraim, such material was expunged from the text. This theory that the aggadic material relating to Job in the original Targum was more extensive, is supported in some measure by the Colophon to the LXX on Job. Assuming that the "Syriac Book" which the writer quotes, was an early Targum, then it was clearly more aggadic in character than the existing text, containing traditions which have survived only in two non-rabbinic sources of high antiquity, the Testament of Job and the Aristeas Fragment.¹⁹ This fact is of additional interest as our existing text of the Targum preserves traditions which once again, have their parallels only in these two early sources. On two occasions, our text describes Job as an inhabitant of "gentile lands",²⁰ a notion completely contrary to rabbinic, Christian and Mohammedan traditions, all of which place Job's residence within the land of Palestine, either at Kefar Karnaim, or at "Magdelah of the Dyers".²¹ Only in two sources is Job depicted as an inhabitant of gentile lands, in the Aristeas Fragment, and in the "Targum" cited by the author of the Colophon to the LXX, both of which locate Job's

residence on the borders of Arabia and Idumaea. In the Targum to 1:15, the marauding bands of Sheba are transformed into the female arch-demon, Lilith, "Queen of Zmargad", who attacks Job. This tradition is a strange one, without any roots in rabbinic Aggadah.²² Only in the Testament of Job do we encounter a comparable notion regarding Satan who disguises himself as the king of Persia in order to attack Job and his family.²³ A further parallel between the Targum to Job and the Testament occurs in connection with Job's three friends. In his rendering of 2:11, the translator adds that, as a result of their visit to Job, his three companions escaped the place prepared for them in hell.²⁴ The source for this tradition is obscure. In rabbinic literature Job's three friends are described in laudable terms as members of Abraham's family circle, and gentile prophets.²⁵ In the Testament of Job, however, great stress is placed upon the salvation which Job procured for his three friends who rejoice at being spared the fate of Elihu, who had been consigned to the nether-world.²⁶

The Targum preserves one further tradition for which there are no parallels in rabbinic sources, but which may, once again, have its origins in early

times. According to the rendering of 1:6, the destruction of Job's family and his possessions took place on Rosh ha-Shanah, while his personal afflictions were decreed on the Day of Atonement (see 2:1). We may observe initially that the tendency to associate the trials and sufferings of martyrs and heroes with the penitential period is a well-established one, as is best illustrated by the Akedah, the martyrdom of Isaac, which dominates the New Year liturgy. It is to be noted however, that this tendency has its origins early in the pre-Christian period. Already in the second century BCE, the author of Jubilees specifies the Day of Atonement as the occasion when Joseph - a prototype for suffering in early sources²⁷ - was sold into slavery.²⁸ This tendency is reflected further in the scriptural lection for Yom Kippur, which opens with a reference to the tragic death of Aaron's two sons. In early sources, this incident figures as an act of *a kippur* *le-liv*.²⁹ which, although it occurred in Nisan, is mentioned specifically on Israel's day of judgement, because the death of the righteous has the same atoning effect as Yom Kippur itself.³⁰ Consequently, the association of Job's suffering with the penitential days may be an ancient tradition which the Targum

alone has preserved. It is to be noted further, that this tradition does have its place in a wider context. We have shown above that the Testament of Job is essentially an early example of martyr literature, containing a number of the literary features common to early Jewish and Christian martyr³¹ia. One of the details listed by Fischel in his study on this subject, which is notably absent in the Testament, is a specific day, usually of prominence, upon which the martyr is subjected to his trial.³² It is significant, therefore, that this detail, missing in a pre-Christian work, should have been preserved in the Targum to Job.

Although this material is too fragmentary to permit the formulation of a concrete theory, it is possible to offer the following hypothesis. The ancient Targum, which may have been pre-Christian in origin, contained numerous aggadic elaborations and amplifications of the biblical narrative, incorporating traditions which have survived mainly in early rabbinic and non-rabbinic sources. We would conjecture further, that this Targum may have contained some reference to the tradition of Job as a martyr figure. We referred above to the well-developed form of this tradition in the

Testament of Job, and to its revival among the scholars at Yabneh in the days of Gamliel.³³ However, we were unable to account for the re-emergence of this tradition after some two centuries of silence. We would suggest, therefore, that its re-emergence may be connected in some way with the reappearance of the ancient Targum to Job at this same period.

II. The Creation of the World and the Generation of the Flood

As we have observed above, the cosmogonic material preserved in the Book of Job was naturally regarded in rabbinic circles as a scriptural source for many details relating to the work of creation, as is indicated by the Rabbis' numerous expositions of proof-texts from the relevant sections of the book.³⁴ In the Targum, however, the creation theme is hardly represented.³⁵ Only in a single instance does the Targum's rendering of a verse coincide with its aggadic exposition on a creation topic. The early Tanna R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos based his theory of the world's creation from its centre on Job 38:38, ³⁶בצקת עפר למוצק ורגלים ידבוקו. The Targum's rendering of this verse clearly coincides with R. Eliezer's Aggadah:-

"When the dust was laid as
a central foundation,³⁷ and
the clods cleaved together."
כך אשתאס עפרא
לשתאסה וגרגשתא
אדבקה.

As Kohler has already suggested, it is possible that the original Targum to Job may have contained considerably more aggadic material relating to cosmogonic themes.³⁸ However, as Targumim were intended primarily for public use, such material may have been purposely expunged from the text by subsequent redactors on account of the interdict against the public instruction of מעשה בראשית. recorded in Hagigah 2:1.

A more serious problem is presented by the paucity of allusions to the Generation of the Flood in the existing text of the Targum, particularly as this trend in the aggadic exegesis of the Book of Job was well-established already in tannaitic times.³⁹ However, this does not exclude the possibility that the Targum originally contained many more allusions to the Antediluvians, their conduct and their punishment, as can be shown from the aggadic fragments preserved in the various editions of the Targum to chapter 24. A considerable number of verses from Job's speech in this chapter

were employed in the homilies of Tannaim and Amoraim on the subject of the flood, thus substantiating the tradition formulated by Judah the Patriarch, that Job's specific role was to reveal the details of this incident.⁴⁰ In printed editions, the Targum on this chapter contains no direct allusions to the Antediluvians, although one or two renderings echo traditions relating to the Generation of the Flood preserved in talmudic-midrashic sources. As Churgin has noted,⁴¹ there is a parallel between the Targum to verse 20, and the exposition of this verse by R. Akiba in Genesis Rabbah 33:5:-

אִיּוֹב: יִשְׁכַּחֵהוּ רַחֵם	תַּרְגוּם: אֲכֹרֵיךְ	ר' עֲקִיבָא: "יִשְׁכַּחֵהוּ
מִתְקֹן רַמָּה עוֹד לֹא	דְּנִשְׂאוּ לִרְחֵמָא	רַחֵם" - הֵן שִׁכְחוּ
יִזְכֹּר וְתִשְׁבֵּר כַּעַץ	מִסְכְּנִיךְ	רַחֲמֵי(ם) מִן הַבְּרִיּוֹת
עוֹלָה.	אֲתַבְּסִימוּ	אִף הַקֶּבֶה שִׁיכָה
	לִרְחֵשָׁא תוֹב לֹא	רַחֲמֵי מֵהֶם. "מִתְקֹן
	יִדְכֹּר וְתִתְּבֹר	רַמָּה" - שְׁמִיתִקֹן
	וְגו'..... ⁴³	רַמָּה מֵהֶם..... ⁴²

Moreover, the Targum to verse 13 renders ^{המה} "They, הַנּוֹן הַזֶּה בְּמִרְדֵּיךְ בְּאוֹרֵי", as ^{היו} "היו בְּמִרְדֵּי אוֹר", were among those who rebelled against the Torah". Although there is nothing in the text to indicate that this refers specifically to the Antediluvians, their rejection of the Law was a well-established tradition in rabbinic circles, as we have shown above.⁴⁴

A further aggadic fragment is preserved in the Antwerp Polyglot version of the Targum to verse 24:

רומו מעט ואינונו והמכו ככל יקפצון וכראש שבלת יפלו
והיך כל מה דעבדו אתפרעו, במיא רתיחין קילקלו, ובמיא
ברותחין קילקלו, וברותחין טפזין ומידון.
".... according to all that
they did they were punished! They behaved corruptly
through 'hot water', consequently they leaped about
in 'hot water', and were punished."). Although,
once again, the Antediluvians are not specifically
mentioned in the text, the allusion to punishment
through scalding water as a result of sexual
degeneracy, clearly reflects R. Hisda's comment on
the Generation of the Flood: ⁴⁵
נידון.

It is the Lagarde text, however, which has preserved the most significant piece of evidence, which may indicate the original scope and structure of the Targum to this chapter. In its rendering of verse 2, with which the detailed description of the conduct and condition of the wicked opens, this text of the Targum inserts the words, דרא דטובענא, thereby referring the passage as a whole to the Antediluvians. Consequently, there is some basis for the assumption that the Targum did contain more extensive aggadic material relating to the Generation

of the Flood , comparable with that preserved in talmudic-midrashic literature, which was removed from the text, possibly as a result of a gradual process of literalization of the Targum.

III. The Expression אור as Rain in the Targum

Having commented on the deficiencies in the aggadic content of the Targum, it is interesting to note that the Targum is the primary source for a particular exegetical motif. We noted above the tradition in the name of R. Johanan b. Nappaha that the expression אור in the speeches of Elihu connotes rain.⁴⁶ This interpretation of אור, although presupposed in several talmudic passages,⁴⁷ occurs only in one source, Ta'anith 7b, where the Amora R. Ammi, in expounding the view that robbery is the cause for draught, renders אור in Job 36:32, על כפים כסה אור, as an allusion to rain on the basis of a further utterance by Elihu, יפיץ ענן אורו אמר ר' אמי: אין הגשמים נעצרים אלא בעון גול, (37:11):⁴⁸ שנאמר "בעון כפים כסה אור", ואין "כפים" אלא חמס שנאמר "ומן החמס אשר בכפיהם (יונה ג' 8)", ואין "אור" אלא מטר שנאמר "יפיץ ענן אורו".

Contrasting strongly with talmudic-midrashic literature, and the sparseness of its own aggadic

content, the Targum preserves no less than five examples for the interpretation of מטר as מטר , 36:30 and 32, 37:11, 15 and 21. The survival of this material in a Targum which may have been divested of much of its former aggadic content, may not be too difficult to explain. In rabbinic thought, as in the traditions of other early societies, life-giving rain occupies a special place in the relationship between God and His worshippers. Far from being a natural phenomenon, rain-fall is a miracle comparable with the entire work of creation.⁴⁹ It is the instrument both of Divine pleasure and of Divine anger, it is the expression of Divine interest in the world and in its inhabitants whose need for rain ensures their attachments to their Creator.⁵⁰ As a Targum was intended essentially for public usage, it is understandable that it should have been employed as a medium for the dissemination of such concepts. Thus the Targum's rendering of Job 37:

- (11) ברם בברירותא מטרך עיבא מבדר ענן מטריה. 11-13:-
 (12, ת'א) והוא ברחמוהי מיא טמיעתא מהפך באפותקוהי לעובדיהון דבני נשא מגלי יתה ומשדר יתהון לכל דפקדוון על אפי תבל ארעא.
 (13) אין מטרא דפורענותא ביממיה (דפוס: ועממיה) ובמדבריה, אין מטרא רויה לאילני טוריה וגלמתא, אין מטרא ניהא דחסדא לחקלי דפרי וכרמי יספקניה.

Notes

1. Cf "Das Targum zu Hiob", MGWJ 1871, pp. 208-223. See also Bacher's similar study on the Targum to Psalms in MGWJ 1872, pp. 408-416, and 463-473. In view of the similarity of diction, hermeneutics and subject-matter between these two Targumim, Bacher regards them as having a common origin.
2. Cf "Targum Ketuvim", New York 1945, pp. 87-116. Both Bacher and Churgin agree that the Targum to Job has its origins in Roman Palestine, particularly in view of its frequent use of Greek words and expressions. While Bacher endeavours to find in the Targum actual allusions to Roman rule, Churgin bases his evidence for the early dating of the Targum upon a thorough analysis of its exegetical method, finding parallels for its renderings of words and expressions in other early Targumim, and in the Greek versions, which suggests that the Targum dates from a period when this particular mode of exegesis was in vogue. Bacher, who maintains that the aggadic content of the Targum was originally more extensive, regards the numerous variant renderings contained in the Targum as original, the later translations having been placed

first. Churgin, however, does not regard Bacher's conclusions as well-founded, as there may be some confusion between the main text and the alternative translations, so that it can no longer be determined with complete certainty which of two renderings originally bore the designation תרגום אחר.

3. See above, p. 24f.

4. The following is a list of allusions in the Targum to pentateuchal topics and personalities:

a) The Creation of the World: 38:12 (Targum B); 41:3; 38:38.

b) Adam: 30:19 (Targum B).

c) Eve and the Tree of Life: 28:7 (Targum).

d) The Generation of the Flood: 4:8; 6:17; 24:20.

e) Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: 3:18; 4:7; 30:19 (Targum B).

f) Lot and his Children: 4:11 (Targum B); 14:18 (Targum B).

g) Ishmael: 4:11 (both versions); 12:6 (both versions); 15:20 (Targum B).

h) The Sodomites: 34:20.

i) Esau: 4:10; 12:5 (Targum B); *ibid.*, 6 (both versions refer to the children of Esau); 15:20.

j) The Tribes of Jacob: 15:18 (Targum B).

k) Israel in Egypt and in the Wilderness: As we observed above, the allusions in the Targum to this particular period of pentateuchal history are notably prominent, reference being made to the bondage, the plagues of darkness and hail, the division of the Red Sea, and the drowning of the Egyptians; Korah, Dathan and Abiram; Balaam, Og, Sihon, the Amalekites, the Midianites, the Ammonites and the Moabites (5:12-15, and 20-23; 7:12; 12:6 (version B); 14:19; 15:29; 34:20; 38:23).

5. See above, pp. 132-134, where these passages are cited in full.
6. See above, p. 387f.
7. See above, p. 389.
8. See Tosephta Shabbat 13:2-3, and the parallels cited by Lieberman ad loc., p. 57.
9. See above, p. 217 , note 26.
10. The following list of passages contains statements by the scholars of Yabneh relating to the whole range of exegetical themes which were associated with the Book of Job, various aspects of

pentateuchal history, the Leviathan, rain-fall, and a number of moral and theological concepts:-

- a) Yoma 52b: R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos on 38:38.
- b) Yoma ibid.: R. Joshua b. Hananiah on 37:6.
- c) GR 13:10 (ed, T-A, p. 119-20): R. Eliezer on 36:28.
- d) GR ibid.: R. Joshua on 36:27.
- e) GR 5:3 (p. 34): R. Eliezer on 38:16.
- f) Lev. R. 14:4: R. Eliezer on 3:9.
- g) BB 74b: R. Eliezer on 41:10.
- h) Tosephta Hullin ³~~4~~, ed. Zuck. p. 506: R. Jose b. Durmaskith on 41:7-8, and 22.
- i) Ta'an. 7b: The School of R. Ishmael on 37:21.
- j) ARN Vers. B, xxxii, ed. Schechter p. 93: R. Akiba on 21:14.
- k) GR 33:5 (p. 310): R. Akiba on 24:20.
- l) ARN loc. cit.: R. Eleazar b. Parta on 21:13.
- m) GR 17:8 (p. 159-60): R. Joshua on 21:33.
- n) ARN Vers. B, ii, p. 9: R. Judah b. Bathyra on 31:2.
- o) Kid. 40b: R. Eleazar b. Zadok on 8:7.
- p) Mechilta Amalek i, ed. Fried. p. 53a: R. Joshua and R. Eleazar b. Hisma on 8:11.
- q) ibid., Beshallah iv, p. 49a: R. Tarphon on 33:24.

11. See Bacher's contention regarding alternative renderings in the Targum, above, p. 393, note 2.
12. See above, p. 46ff, and particularly R. Meir's statement, p. 82, note 37.
13. Cf ARN Vers. A, ii, p. 12.
14. Cf R. Judah b. Bathyra's statement, ARN Vers.B, ii, p. 9.
15. Cf ARN Vers. A, xiv, p. 58-9, the account of the attempts of Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai's pupils to comfort him on the loss of his son, by citing the examples of Adam, Job, Aaron and David who suffered similar tragedies, yet were comforted.
16. Cf Targum Sheni to Esther 1. Although this source is a late one, the list of the seven patriarchs it contains, which still retains pre-Abrahamic personalities (Adam, Noah and Shem, as well as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Job) may be early, presumably more original than the list recorded in PR 8, 2^a~~ab~~, which consists notably of post-Abrahamic personalities (Kehath, Amram, Moses and Aaron, in addition to the traditional patriarchal figures). We would suggest, therefore, that the former list belongs to a period when Christian polemics had not

yet discredited the pre-Abrahamic personalities in Jewish circles. The latter list, however, containing exclusively Israelite personalities, represents a revision of earlier traditions under the pressure of Christian teachings.

17. See above, p. 60 ; also PR 47, 190a, where God is portrayed as challenging Job to prove his supremacy over Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Moses and Aaron, whose powers of forbearance he could not equal.

18. Cf Tanh. B. I, p. 166: א'ל אליפו לאיוב: הרי אתה אומר, למה איני כאברהם? כך אמרת „הרני לחומר ואתמשל כעפר ואפר" סבור אתה שהוא משה אותך לו? א'ר ברכיה: סרס קרא ודרשהו! „ואתמשל כעפר ואפר" והוא דן אותך כדור הפלגה שכתוב בהם „ותהי להם וגו' (והחמר היה להם לחמר בר' י' א, 3)." .

19. See above, note 4, p. 69.

20. Cf 8:2-3, also Churgin's comment on these verses op. cit., p. 113.

21. Cf Ginzberg, "Legends", V, note 21, p. 385f; also S. Klein, "Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas", p. 81f.

22. Cf however, BB 16a, where R. Nathan condemns the interpretation of שׂמא as a person rather than a kingdom, which suggests that such an interpretation

was current, the precise nature of which cannot be determined; see further Ginzberg op. cit., p. 385.

23. Cf 4:13 (ed. Brock 17:2, p. 30).

24. ... ואתו גבר מאתריה (ובהא זכותא אחפציו מן אתר
מזומן להון בגהנם).

25. See the material collected by Ginzberg op. cit.,
p. 387, notes 31-2.

26. Above, p. 44, and notes 16-17 ad loc..

27. Cf Fischel op.cit., p. 273.

28. Cf 34:10-20.

29. See material cited by Ginzberg op. cit., VI,
p. 75, note 383; also Lev. R. 20:12: א'ר חייא בר אבא:
באחד בניסן מתו בניו של אהרון ולמה מזכיר מיתתן ביה'כ?
אלא מלמד שכשם שיום הכפורים מכפר, כך מיתתן של צדיקים
מכפרת ...

30. It is conceivable that this tendency of associating
the suffering of the righteous with the Day of
Atonement, may also be reflected in the choice of
books which might be read to the High Priest during
the night of Yom Kippur, which included Job and
Daniel (cf Yoma 1:6) both books recording the trials
of the righteous for their faith.

31. See above, p. 42f.
32. Fischel op. cit., p. 383 (4. The significance of a special day).
33. See above, p. 46ff.
34. See above, p. 188ff.
35. Although the phrases, *יומי בראשית* and *עובדי בראשית* occur, (cf 38:12 and 41:3) they are not accompanied by any aggadic material or cosmogonic theories.
36. See above, p. 197.
37. For an explanation of this rendering of *מוצק*, see above, p. 221, note 35.
38. Cf "The Testament of Job" op. cit., p. 266.
39. See above, p. 320ff.
40. See above, p. 20.
41. Op. cit., p. 104.
42. *"ישכחו רחם"*, they forgot mercy towards their fellow-men, consequently, God forgot His mercy towards them! *מתקן רמה* means the worms fed sweetly upon them".
43. "The cruel ones who forget to love the poor are sweet feeding to the worm.....".

44. See above, p. 329ff.

45. See above, p. 377., note 94, and particularly note 93 (p. 376), R. Johanan's exposition of Job 6:17, בעה יזרבו נצמתו בחמו נדעכו ממקומם, which is clearly reflected in the Targum's rendering of this verse: בעדן דחבו דר טובענא, אשתרבו אומגדו ברתחיה אתמחאו מן אתריהון.

46. See above, p. 35, note 5.

47. See R. Ammi's comment on Job 36:33 - presupposing the interpretation of אור in the preceding verse, as rain - that rain fails in a generation through the lack of those skilled in reciting incantations (Ta'an. 8a):
אם ראית דור שהשמים משתכין כנחושת מלהוריד טל ומטר, בשביל לוחשי לחישות שאין בדור. מאי תקנתן? ילכו אצל מי שיודע ללחוש, דכתיב "יגיד עליו רעו".....

See also the expositions of Job 37:13, preserved in both Palestinian and Babylonian sources, which, once again, presuppose the interpretation of the expression in verse 11, as rain. The three expositions which follow, are all variants of the same theme, the punitive and beneficial effects of rain-fall, a theme taken up by the Targum to Job ad loc., cited above:-

ירוש' תענית ג (66c)

בזכות ג' דברים

בבלי תענית ה, ע"ב

א'ר שמואל בר נחמני: מאי דכתיב

„אם לשבת אם לארצו אם לחסד הגשמים יורדים,
 ימציאהו?" „אם לשבת (=יסורין)" בזכות הארץ, בזכות
 בהרים ובגבעות, „אם לחסד החסד, בזכות
 ימציאהו לארצו" בשדות ובכרמים. היסורין, ושלשתן
 „אם לשבת" לאילנות, „אם לארצו" בפסוק אחד „אם לשבת
 לזרעים, „אם לחסד ימציאהו" אם לארצו אם לחסד
 בורות, שיחין ומערות. ימציאהו".

48. R. Ammi's exposition of Job 36:32 is clearly
 reflected in the Targum to Job ad loc.: מטול חטוף ידא
 מנע מטרא ופקיד עלוי למחת מטול מצלי.

49. Cf R. Hoshaiiah's comment, based on Job 5:9 and 10
 in GR 13:4 (p. 115): קשה היא גבורת גשמים ששקולה כנגד
 כל מעשה בראשית, מ'ט? „עושה גדולות ואין חקר (נפלאות
 עד אין מספר)", במה? „הנותן מטר על פני ארץ ושולח מים
 על פני חוצות".

50. See initially Ta'an. 7b-8a, and PT Ta'an. 3, 66c,
 from which several statements are cited above; see
 further, GR 13:3f (p. 115f), and particularly the
 statement reported in the name of R. Shemuel b.
 Nahmani (ibid., 9, p. 119) who, in connection with
 Job 5:11, offers four reasons for God's adopting
 rain in place of the primordial irrigation of the
 world, to ensure the water-supply of the weak, to
 disperse the evil vapours, to ensure the irrigation
 of the highlands as well as the lowlands, and to
 ensure man's attachment to his Maker.